THE NEW

SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA

OF

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN

AND

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(*Associate Editors*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(*Department of Systematic Theology*)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(*Department of Minor Denominations*)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(*Department of the New Testament*)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(*Department of Church History*)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography*)

Complete in Twelve Volumes

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE NEW

SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA

OF

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN

AND

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(*Associate Editors*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(*Department of Systematic Theology*)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(*Department of Minor Denominations*)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(*Department of the New Testament*)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(*Department of Church History*)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography*)

VOLUME IV
DRAESEKE — GOA

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

Registered at Stationers' Hall, London, England

[*Printed in the United States of America*]
Published August, 1909

EDITORS

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.)
Professor of Church History, New York University.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN
Editor in Biblical Criticism and Theology on "The New International Encyclopedia," New York.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
New York, Formerly Professor of Biblical History and Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary.

DEPARTMENT EDITORS, VOLUME IV

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(*Department of Systematic Theology.*)
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(*Department of Minor Denominations.*)
Formerly Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders.*)
President of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y.

JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY, Ph.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament.*)
Professor of Oriental Languages, University College, Toronto.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(*Department of the New Testament.*)
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(*Department of Church History.*)
Professor of Church History, Baylor Theological Seminary (Baylor University), Waco, Tex.

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography.*)
Managing Editor of the STANDARD DICTIONARY, etc.,
New York City.

CONTRIBUTORS AND COLLABORATORS, VOLUME IV

ERNST CHRISTIAN ACHELIS, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Marburg.

HANS ACHELIS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Theology, University of Halle.

WILLIAM ADAMSON, D.D.,
Pastor of the Carver Memorial Church, Windermere, England.

WILHELM ALTMANN, Ph.D.,
Director of the Deutsche Musiksammlung, Berlin.

SAMUEL JAMES ANDREWS (†), D.D.,
Late Pastor of the Catholic Apostolic Church, Hartford, Conn.

FERENCZ BALOGH,
Professor of Church History, Reformed Theological Academy, Debreczin, Hungary.

EDOUARD BARDE (†),
Late Professor of New Testament Exegesis, School of Theology, Geneva.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES, Ph.D.,
Writer on Civil Church Law.

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

JOHANNES BELSHEIM,
Pastor Emeritus, Christiania, Norway.

KARL BENRATH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Theology, University of Königsberg.

IMMANUEL GUSTAV ADOLF BENZINGER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
German Orientalist and Vice-Consul for Holland in Jerusalem.

CARL BERTHEAU, Th.D.,
Pastor of St. Michael's, Hamburg.

BERNHARD BESS, Th.Lic.,
Librarian of the University of Halle.

EMIL BLOESCH (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, Bern.

HEINRICH BOEHMER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Professor of Church History, University of Bonn.

AMY GASTON CHARLES AUGUSTE BONET-MAURY, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Independent School of Divinity, Paris.

GOTTLIEB NATHANAEL BONWETSCH, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

GUSTAV BOSSERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Retired Pastor, Stuttgart.

FRANTS PEDER WILLIAM BUHL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages, University of Copenhagen.

KARL BURGER (†), Th.D.,
Late Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Munich.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.,
Formerly Corresponding Secretary of the Methodist Missionary Society.

WALTER CASPARI, Ph.D., Th. Lic.,
University Preacher and Professor of Practical Theology, University of Erlangen.

JOHAN ANTERS CEDERBERG, Th.D.,
Provost in St. Michel, Finland.

JACQUES EUGÈNE CHOISY, Th.D.,
Pastor in Geneva.

PERCIVALE CHUBB,
Director and Teacher in the Ethical Culture School, New York.

JOSEPH BOURNE CLARKE, D.D.,
Editorial Secretary of the Congregational Home Missionary Society, New York.

JOHN CLIFFORD, D.D., LL.D.,
Minister of Praed Street and Westhourne Park Church, London.

FERDINAND COHRS, Th.Lic.,
Consistorial Councilor, Ilfeld, Germany.

HENRY COWAN, D.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Aberdeen, Scotland.

AUGUST HERMANN CREMER (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Greifswald.

FRIEDRICH WILHELM CUNO (†), Th.Lic.,
Late Pastor at Eddigehausen, Hanover.

GUSTAF HERMAN DALMAN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic, and President of the German Evangelical Archeological Institute, Jerusalem.

SAMUEL MARTIN DEUTSCH, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Berlin.

FRANZ WILHELM DIBELIUS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, City Superintendent, and Pastor of the Kreuzkirche, Dresden.

ERNST VON DOBSCHUETZ, Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Strasburg.

PAUL GOTTFRIED DREWS, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Halle.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.,
President of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y.

EMIL EGLI, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Zurich.

JACQUES EHNI (†),
Late Pastor in Geneva.

EPHRAIM EMERTON, Ph.D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Harvard University.

KARL ENDERS, Th.D.,
Pastor at Frankfort-on-the-Main.

CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH DAVID ERDMANN (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Honorary Professor of Church History, University of Breslau.

THEODOR FOERSTER (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Halle.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of History, Olivet College, Mich.

EMIL ALBERT FRIEDBERG, Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical, Public, and German Law, University of Leipsic.

OTTO FRIDOLIN FRITZSCHE (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Zurich.

WILHELM GASS (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Heidelberg.

KARL GELZER,
Pastor in Basel.

WILHELM GERMANN (†), Th.D.,
Late Superintendent in Schleusingen, Prussian Saxony.

CHARLES RIPLEY GILLETT, D.D., L.H.D.,
Registrar, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

JOHN LEWIS GILLIN, Ph.D.,
President of Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.,
Former Professor of Biblical History and Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary.

WALTER GOETZ, Ph.D.,
Professor of History, University of Tübingen.

WILHELM GOETZ, Ph.D.,
Honorary Professor of Geography, Technical High School, and Professor, Military Academy, Munich.

HERMANN FREIHERR VON DER GOLTZ (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Dogmatics, University of Berlin.

GEORG GRUETZMACHER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Extraordinary Professor of Church History, University of Heidelberg.

HERMANN GUTHE, Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

HEINRICH HAHN, Ph.D.,
Formerly Professor of History and German in the Luisenstadt Realgymnasium, Berlin.

ADOLF HARNACK, M.D., Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
General Director of the Royal Library, Berlin.

ALBERT HAUCK, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Church History, University of Leipsic, Editor-in-Chief of the Hauck-Herzog *Realencyklopädie.*

HERMAN HAUPT, Ph.D.,
Professor and Director of the University Library, Giessen.

AUGUST WILHELM HEGLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Tübingen.

CARL FRIEDRICH GEORG HEINRICI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

MAX HEINZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Philosophy, University of Leipsic.

ERNST HENKE (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Marburg.

LUDWIG THEODOR EDGAR HENNECKE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Betheln, Hanover.

JOHANN JAKOB HERZOG (†), Ph.D.,Th.D.,
Late Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

PAUL HINSCHIUS (†), Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Late Professor of Ecclesiastical Law, University of Berlin.

KARL HOLL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Berlin.

WILHELM HOLLENBERG (†), Ph.D.,
Late Gymnasial Rector, Bonn.

PAUL IRION,
Pastor Bethel Evangelical Church, Freedom Township, Mich.

FERDINAND FRIEDRICH WILHELM KATTENBUSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Halle.

PETER GUSTAV KAWERAU, Th.D.,
Consistorial Councilor, Provost at St. Peter's, and Honorary Professor, University of Berlin.

DIETRICH KERLER (†), Ph.,D.,
Late Head Librarian, Würzhurg.

OTTO KIRN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Leipsic.

RUDOLF KITTEL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

HUGO WILHELM PAUL KLEINERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Practical Theology, University of Berlin.

HEINRICH AUGUST KLOSTERMANN, Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Kiel.

KARL AUGUST KLUEPFEL (†), Ph.D.,
Late Head Librarian, University of Tühingen.

RUDOLF KOEGEL (†), Ph. D., Th.D.,
Late Court Preacher, Berlin.

FRIEDRICH EDUARD KOENIG, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

CHRISTOPH FRIEDRICH ADOLF KOLB, Th.D.,
Prelate and Court Preacher, Ludwigshurg.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH HERMANN KOLDE, Ph. D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Erlangen.

RICHARD KRAETZSCHMAR (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Marburg.

HERMANN GUSTAV EDUARD KRUEGER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Giessen.

ROBERT KUEBEL (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Pastoral Theology, University of Tübingen.

JOHANNES WILHELM KUNZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology, University of Greifswald.

KARL LUDWIG LEIMBACH (†), Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Late Provincial Councilor for Schools, Hanover.

LUDWIG LEMME, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Heidelherg.

BRUNO LINDNER, Ph.D.,
Professor of Aryan Languages, University of Leipsic.

THOMAS MARTIN LINDSAY, M.A., D.D.,
Principal United Free Church College, Glasgow.

GEORG LOESCHE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, Evangelical Theological Faculty, Vienna.

FRIEDRICH ARMIN LOOFS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Halle.

WILHELM PHILIPP FRIEDRICH FERDINAND LOTZ, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Erlangen.

AYLMER MAUDE,
Author and Lecturer, Great Baddow, Chelmsford, England.

EDWIN DOAK MEAD,
Author and Lecturer, Boston, Mass.

OTTO MEJER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late President of the Consistory, Hanover.

PHILIPP MEYER, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Hanover.

GEROLD MEYER VON KNONAU, Ph.D.,
Professor of History, University of Zurich.

CARL THEODOR MIRBT, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Marhurg.

JACOB ISIDOR MOMBERT, D.D.,
Author, Patterson, N. J.

JOHN HENRY MOORE,
Elder and Bishop of the Dunker Church, Editor of *The Gospel Messenger*, Elgin, Ill.

HERMANN MOSAPP, Ph.D.,
Councilor for Schools, Stuttgart.

ERNST FRIEDRICH KARL MUELLER, Th.D.,
Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

GEORG MUELLER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Inspector of Schools, Leipsic.

JOSEPH THEODOR MUELLER, Th.D.,
Keeper of the Archives in Herrnhut.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.,
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

CHRISTOF EBERHARD NESTLE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Maulhronn, Württemberg.

KARL JOHANNES NEUMANN, Ph.D.,
Professor of Ancient History, University of Strashurg.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Baylor Theological Seminary, Waco, Texas.

THEODOR JULIUS NEY, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Speyer, Bavaria.

FREDERICK CHRISTIAN NIELSEN (†), D.D.,
Late Bishop of Aarhus, Denmark.

FRIEDRICH AUGUST NITZSCH (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Kiel.

CONRAD VON ORELLI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and History of Religion, University of Basel.

EDWARDS AMASA PARK (†), D.D.,
Late Professor in Andover Theological Seminary.

EMILY PATERSON,
Secretary of the Egypt Exploration Fund, London.

CARL PFENDER,
Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Paris.

JOHANNES PFOTENHAUER,
Pastor in Bruchnachtersen.

ERWIN PREUSCHEN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Pastor at Hirschhorn-on-the-Neckar, Germany.

HERMANN RAHLENBECK,
Pastor in Cologne.

RUDOLF ROCHOLL (†), Th.D.,
Late Ecclesiastical Councilor, Düsseldorf.

ROBERT WILLIAM ROGERS, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

HENDRIK CORNELIS ROGGE (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of History, University of Harlem.

HENRY KALLOCH ROWE,
Professor of Church History in Newton Theological Seminary, Newton, Mass.

CARL VICTOR RYSSEL (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Zurich.

EUGEN SACHSSE, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Bonn.

THEODOR SCHAEFER, Th.D.,
Head of the Deaconess Institute, Altona.

DAVID SCHLEY SCHAFF, D.D.,
Professor of Church History, Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.

PHILIP SCHAFF (†), D.D., LL.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTOPH T. GOTTLOB VON SCHEURL (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor in Nuremberg.

REINHOLD SCHMID, Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Oberholzheim, Württemberg.

CARL SCHMIDT (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Strasburg.

KARL SCHMIDT, Th.D.,
Pastor at Goldberg, Mecklenburg.

WILHELM SCHMIDT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Breslau.

JOHANNES SCHNEIDER,
Emeritus Pastor, Darmstadt.

CARL WILHELM SCHOELL (†), Ph.D., D.D.,
Late Pastor of the Savoy Church, London.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH SCHOTT (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Librarian and Professor of Theology, University of Stuttgart.

JOHANN FRIEDRICH RITTER VON SCHULTE, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Law, University of Bonn.

LUDWIG THEODOR SCHULZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Rostock.

OTTO SEEBASS, Ph.D.,
Educator, Leipsic, Germany.

REINHOLD SEEBERG, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology University of Berlin.

EMIL SEHLING, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical and Commercial Law, University of Erlangen.

CHRISTIAAN SEPP (†), Th.D.,
Late Mennonite Preacher, Leyden.

ISAAC SHARPLESS, LL.D.,
President of Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

FRIEDRICH ANTON EMIL SIEFFERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics and New Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

ALBERT SOCIN (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Oriental Languages, University of Leipsic.

JOHANN LEONHARD SOMMER (†), Th.Lic.,
Late Dean at Neustadt-an-der-Aisch, Bavaria.

SAMUEL PETER SPRENG, D.D.,
Editor of *The Evangelical Messenger*, Cleveland, O.

RUDOLF STAEHELIN (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Basel.

ANTHONY ANASTASIOU STAMOULI,
Formerly Member of the Editorial Staff of *Atlantis*, New York.

GEORG EDUARD STEITZ (†), Th.D.,
Late Pastor, Frankfort-on-the-Main.

ROBERT WALTER STEWART, B.Sc., B.D.,
Glasgow, Scotland.

PHILIPP STRAUCH, Ph.D.,
Professor of Germanic Languages, University of Halle.

KARL THIEME, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Leipsic.

FRIEDRICH AUGUST THEODOR THOLUCK (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Halle.

ERNST PETER WILHELM TROELTSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Heidelberg.

PAUL TSCHACKERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

JOHANN GERHARD WILHELM UHLHORN (†), Th.D.,
Late Abbot of Lokkum, Germany.

WILHELM VOLCK (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Rostock.

JULIUS AUGUST WAGENMANN (†),
Late Consistorial Councilor, Göttingen.

WILHELM MARKUS WALTHER, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Rostock.

JOHANNES WEISS, Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Heidelberg.

AUGUST WILHELM WERNER, Th.D.,
Pastor Primarius, Guben, Prussia.

RUDOLF ZEHNPFUND, Ph.D.,
Minister in Oranienbaum.

OTTO ZOECKLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History and Apologetics, University of Greifswald.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX—VOLS. I—IV

The following list of books is supplementary to the bibliographies given at the end of the articles contained in volumes I.–IV., and brings the literature down to June, 1909. In this list each vocabulary entry is printed in capital letters.

ALTAR: J. Wright, *Some Notable Altars in the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church*, London, 1909.

ANSELM, SAINT, OF CANTERBURY: G. C. Foley, *Anselm's Theory of the Atonement*, London, 1908.

APHRAATES: P. Schwen, *Untersuchungen über den persischen Weisen*, Leipsic, 1906.

APOCRYPHA: *Wisdom of Solomon in R. V.; with Introduction and Notes*, by J. A. F Gregg, Cambridge, 1909.

ARABIA: G. R. Lees, *The Witness of the Wilderness, The Bedawin of the Desert: Their Origin, History, Home Life, Strife, Religion and Superstition, in Their Relation to the Bible*, London, 1909.

ARCHEOLOGY, CHRISTIAN: A. L. Frothingham, *Monuments of Christian Rome*, London and New York, 1909.

ARK OF THE COVENANT: M. Dibelius, *Die Lade Jahves. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Tübingen, 1908.

ASSYRIA: H. Winckler, *The History of Babylonia and Assyria*. Eng. transl. by J. A. Greig, London, 1908. See also BABYLONIA, below.

ATONEMENT: J. Riviere, *The Doctrine of Atonement*, vol. i., London, 1909. Also see ANSELM, above.

ATTERBURY, F.: H. C. Beeching, *Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester (1662–1732)*, London, 1909.

BABCOCK, M. D.: T. J. Stone, *Footsteps in a Parish*, New York, 1909.

BABYLONIA: See ASSYRIA, above; also: E. Combe, *Histoire du culte de Sin, en Babylonie et en Assyrie*, London, 1909.

S. Langdon, *Early Sumerian Psalms (Transliteration, Translation, Critical Commentary and Introduction)*, Leipsic, 1908.

H. de Genouillac, *Tabletts sumériennes archaïques. Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la société sumérienne, avec transcriptions, traduction et notes*, Paris, 1909.

P. Toscanne, *Les Idéogrammes cunéiformes. Signes archaïques*, Paris, 1909.

BAPTISM: H. Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte*, Tübingen, 1908.

BAPTISTS: J. R. Wood and S. Chick, *A Manual of the Order and Administration of the Baptist Church*, London, 1909.

BAUR, F. C.: G. Fraedrich, *F C. Baur, der Begründer der Tübinger Schule*, Gotha, 1909.

BIBLE TEXT: F. J. Bonnasieux, *Les Évangiles synoptiques de S. Hilaire de Poitiers*, Paris, 1908.

W. Streitberg, *Die gotische Bibel*. Part 1, *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage mit Einleitung Lesarten und Quellenachweisen sowie den kleineren Denkmälern als Anhang*, Heidelberg, 1908.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM: J. R. Harris, *Sidelights on New Testament Research*, London, 1909.

W. G. Jordan, *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought; or, the Place of the O. T. Documents in the Life of To-day*, Edinburgh, 1909.

BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION: J. Beet, *The New Testament. Its Authorship, Date and Worth*, London, 1909.

A. S. Geden, *Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, Edinburgh and New York, 1909.

A. Harnack, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Leipsic, 1908.

BIGG, C.: *The Spirit of Christ in Common Life: Addresses and Sermons*, London and New York, 1909.

BLAURER, A.: *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer 1509–48, ed. T. Schiess*, vol. i., *1509–June, 1538*, Freiburg, 1909.

BONAR, H.: *Memorials of Dr. Horatius Bonar*, Edinburgh, 1909.

BRAHMANISM: L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Le Védisme*, Paris, 1909.

BUDDHISM: A. J. Edmunds, *Buddhist and Christian Gospels . Gospel Parallels from Pali Text*, London, 1909.

D. Gogerly, *Ceylon Buddhism*, ed. A. S. Bishop, London, 1909.

Sayings of Buddha, the Iti Vuttaka; a Pali work of the Buddhist Canon; Translation with Introduction and Notes, by J. H. Moore, New York, 1909.

V. G. Smith, *The Edicts of Asoka*, privately printed, London, 1909.

BUGENHAGEN, J.: G. Geisenhof, *Bibliotheca Bugenhagiana. Bibliographie der Druckschriften des D. J Bugenhagen*, Leipsic, 1908.

BUSH, G.: *Statement of Reasons for Embracing the Doctrines and Disclosures of Emanuel Swedenborg. With biographical Sketch*, New York, 1898.

CALVIN, J.: W. Wileman, *John Calvin: his Life, his Teaching, and his Influence*, London, 1908.

A. Bossert, *Johann Calvin*, Giessen, 1908.

P. Vollmer and others, *John Calvin, Theologian, Preacher, Educator, Statesman*, Philadelphia, Pa., 1909.

A German translation of the first ed. of Calvin's "Institutes" was made by B. Speiss, Wiesbaden, 1887.

CASAS, B. DE LAS: F A. MacNutt, *Bartholomew de las Casas: his Life, his Apostolate and his Writings*, New York and London, 1909.

CATHARINE, SAINT, OF GENOA: F. von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion, as Studied in Catharine of Genoa and her Friends*, 2 vols., London, 1909.

CEMETERIES: Florence E. Blake-Hedges, *The Story of the Catacombs*, Cincinnati, 1909.
M. Besnier, *Les Catacombes de Rome*, Paris, 1909.

CENSORSHIP AND PROHIBITION OF BOOKS: F. S. Betten, *The Roman Index of Forbidden Books*, St. Louis, 1909.

CHAPMAN, J. W.: *Another Mile; and other Addresses*, New York, 1908.

CHINA: A. R. Kelly, *The Great Chinese Awakening. Glimpses of China and its People*, London, 1909.

COLET, J.: J. H. Lupton, *A Life of John Colet, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's and Founder of St. Paul's School*, 2d ed., London and New York, 1909.

COLIGNY: C. Merki, *L'Amiral de Coligny, 1519–72*, Paris, 1909.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION: T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, London, 1909.
L. Frobenius, *The Childhood of Man*, London, 1909 (on primitive religion).
J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, 3 vols., London, 1909.

CONVERSION: N. H. Marshall, *Conversion or the New Birth*, London, 1909.

DIETRICH OF NIEHEIM: W J. M. Mulder, *Dietrich von Nieheim. Zijne opvatting van het concilie en zijne kroniek*, vols. i.–ii., Amsterdam, 1907

DISEASES AND THE HEALING ART: *Expository Times*, April, 1909, pp. 332–333 (on the bubonic plague).

DIVINATION: M. C. Baillod, *L'Art de la divination*, Paris, 1909.

DOGMA, DOGMATICS: B. P. Bowne, *Studies in Christianity*, Boston, 1909.
J. Orr, *Sidelights on Christian Doctrine*, New York, 1909.

DREAM: A. Löwinger, *Der Traum in der jüdischen Literatur*, Leipsic, 1908.

DU BOSE, W P.: *High Priesthood and Sacrifice; an Exposition of Hebrews*, New York, 1908.

DUNS SCOTUS: P. Minges, *Der angebliche exzessive Realismus des Duns Scotus*, Münster, 1908.

DUNSTAN, SAINT: F A. and E. Gasquet, *The Bosworth Psalter*, New York, 1909 (contains an appendix on the birth date of St. Dunstan).

DUPUY, B.: H. Dupuy, *The Huguenot Bartholomew Dupuy and his Descendants*, Beverly, W. Va., 1908.

DURIE, J.: K. Brauer, *Die Unionstätigkeit John Duries unter dem Protektorat Cromwells. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Marburg, 1907.

EASTER: J. Schmid, *Die Osterfestberechnung in der abendländischen Kirche vom 1. allgemeinen konzil zu Nicäa bis zum Ende viii. Jahrhunderts*, St. Louis, 1908.

EASTERN CHURCH: W. F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, New York, 1908.

EDDY, M. B. G.: MRS. S. W. O'Brien, *The Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy*, New York, 1908.

EDOM: G. Dalman, *Petra und seine Felsheiligtümer*, Leipsic, 1908.

EDWARDS, JONATHAN, THE ELDER: (in) W Walker, *Greatest Men of the Christian Church*, Chicago, 1908.

EGYPT: E. Amélineau, *Prolégomènes à l'étude de la religion égyptienne. Essai sur la mythologie de l'Égypte*, Paris, 1908.
E. A. W Budge, *The Book of the Kings of Egypt*, 2 vols., London, 1908–09.
J. G. Duncan, *The Exploration of Egypt and the Old Testament*, New York, 1909.
W. M. F. Petrie, *Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity*, London, 1909.

ELAGABALUS: O. F. Butler, *Studies in the Life of Heliogabalus*, New York, 1908.

ELIZABETH OF THURINGIA: A. Huyskens, *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der heiligen Elisabeth, Landgräfin von Thüringen*, Marburg, 1908.

ENGLAND: F C. Kempson, *The Church in Modern England: a Study of the Place in Christendom and the distinctive Mission to the World of the Anglican Communion*, New York, 1908.
Dom. F. Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands*, Paris, 1909.

ENGLAND, CHURCH OF: G. R. Balleine, *A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England*, London, 1908.
W. H. Hutton, *The Age of Revolution. Being an Outline of the History of the Church 1648-1815*, London, 1908.
W. M. Kennedy, *The "Interpretations" of the Bishops and their Influence on Elizabethan Episcopal Policy*, New York, 1908.
W H. Mallock, *Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption; being an Examination of the intellectual Position of the Church of England*, London, 1909.
M. W. Patterson, *History of the Church of England*, London, 1909.

ENLIGHTENMENT: C. Kolb, *Die Aufklärung in der Württembergischen Kirche*, Stuttgart, 1908.

EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF: G. Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ephesinischen Konzils vom Jahre 431*, Leipsic, 1908.

ERASMUS: P. S. Allen, *Erasmus Selections. Principally from his Epistles; with Life of Erasmus*, Oxford, 1908.
Altera colloquia Latina, Adapted from Erasmus, New York, 1908.

ESTHER: *The Book of Esther; Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, with Notes*, by P. Haupt, Chicago, 1908.
L. B. Paton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*, New York, 1908.

ETHICS: E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, London, 1908.
T. von Haering, *The Ethics of the Christian Life*, New York, 1909.
M. Cronin, *The Science of Ethics*, vol. i., Dublin, 1909.
J. Dewey and J. H. Tufts, *Ethics*, London, 1909.

EUCHARIST: T. E. Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, London, 1908.

G. Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Busssakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche*, Freiburg, 1908.

D. Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 2 vols., London, 1909.

EVOLUTION: *Fifty Years of Darwinism*, New York, 1909.

EZEKIEL: J. Hermann, *Ezekielstudien*, Leipsic, 1908.

EZRA-NEHEMIAH: G. Klameth, *Ezras Leben und Wirken*, Vienna, 1908.

G. Jahn, *Die Bücher Ezra (A und B) und Nehemja textkritisch und historisch und historisch-kritisch untersucht mit Erklärung der Einschluss*, Leyden, 1909.

FEASTS AND FESTIVALS: H. Grimme, *Das israelitische Pfingstfest und der Plejadenkult*, Paderborn, 1907.

K. A. H. Kellner, *Heortology. A History of the Christian Festivals from their Origin to the Present Day*, London, 1909.

FRANCE: A. Debidour, *L'Église catholique et l'état sous la troisième république (1870–1906)*, vol. ii. (*1889–1906*), Paris, 1909.

G. Desdevises du Dézert, *L'Église et l'état en France depuis le concordat jusqu'à nos jours (1801–1906)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1909.

FRANCIS, SAINT, OF ASSISI, AND THE FRANCISCAN ORDER: *The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi*, New York, 1908.

F. Kunz, *Der heilige Franz von Assisi*, Munich, 1908.

W. M. Bryce, *The Scottish Grey Friars*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1909.

FREEMASONS: W. Begemann, *Vorgeschichte und Anfänge der Freimaurerei in England. 1. Buch: Die alten englischen Werklogen und ihre Spröstlinge*, Berlin, 1909.

FRENCH REVOLUTION, RELIGIOUS EFFECTS OF: E. Lafond, *La Politique religieuse de la révolution française*, Paris, 1908.

P. Pisani, *L'Église de Paris et la révolution*, vol. i., *1789–92*, Paris, 1908.

FRIENDS: A. J. Edmunds, *Quaker Literature in the Libraries of Philadelphia*, Philadelphia, 1908.

FRIENDSHIP: H. C. King, *The Laws of Friendship—Human and Divine*, New York, 1909.

FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES: R. Seeberg, *The Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion*, New York, 1908.

GIBSON, AGNES: Marian H. Fishe, *My Father's Business; or a brief Sketch of the Life and Works of Agnes Gibson*, London, 1909.

GIFFORD LECTURES: H. Driesch, *The Science and Philosophy of the Organism: the Gifford Lectures for 1907*, New York, 1909.

GILDAS THE WISE: J. Briel, *Saint Gildas, abbé de Rhuys*, Vannes, 1908.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

ABBOTT, EDWARD: d. at Boston, Mass., Apr. 5, 1908.

ALLEN, ALEXANDER VIETS GRISWOLD: d. at Cambridge, Mass., July 1, 1908.

AMBROSE, SAINT: Should be " d. 397 " for " 379."

ANDERSON, WILLIAM FRANKLIN: Elected bishop 1908.

ANDREWS, EDWARD GAYER: d. at Brooklyn, N. Y., Dec. 31, 1907.

APPEL, THEODORE: d. at Lancaster, Pa., Sept. 28, 1907.

ATKINS, JAMES: Elected bishop 1906.

BAENTSCH, BRUNO JOHANNES LEOPOLD: d. at Jena Oct. 27, 1908.

BAILEY, HENRY: d. at Canterbury Dec. 29, 1906.

BARROWS, SAMUEL JUNE: d. at New York City Apr. 21, 1909.

BIGELMAIER, ANDREAS: Became professor of church history at Dillingen 1906.

BONNET, ALFRED MAXIMILIEN: b. Nov. 3, 1841.

BORNHAEUSER, KARL BERNHARD: Became professor of systematic and practical theology at Marburg 1907.

BROWN, FRANCIS: Became president of Union Theological Seminary 1908.

BUNBURY, THOMAS: d. at Shandrum Jan. 19, 1907.

Vol. i., p. 17, col. 1, line 26: Read " Kraus " for " King."

Vol. i., p. 332, col. 1, line 9: Read " Sennacherib's " for " Sargon's."

Vol. ii., p. 150, col. 1, line 27: Read " 1816 " for " 1886."

Vol. ii., p. 330, col. 1, line 9 from bottom: Read " Methodist " for " Congregational."

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations in common use or self-evident are not included here. For additional information concerning the works listed, see vol. i., pp. viii.–xx., and the appropriate articles in the body of the work.

ADB .. .... *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq., vol. 53, 1907
Adv ... ... *adversus*, " against "
AJP..... .. *American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore, 1880 sqq.
AJT.. ... *American Journal of Theology*, Chicago, 1897 sqq.
AKR..... .. *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, Innsbruck, 1857–61, Mainz, 1872 sqq.
ALKG.... ... *Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1885 sqq.
Am.... ... American
AMA.... ... *Abhandlungen der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1763 sqq.
ANF..... ... *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American edition by A. Cleveland Coxe, 8 vols. and index, Buffalo, 1887; vol. ix., ed. Allan Menzies, New York, 1897
Apoc.. .... .. Apocrypha, apocryphal
Apol... ... *Apologia, Apology*
Arab. ... .. Arabic
Aram .. .... Aramaic
art..... ... article
Art. Schmal .... Schmalkald Articles
ASB..... .. *Acia sanctorum*, ed. J. Bolland and others, Antwerp, 1643 sqq.
ASM..... *Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, ed. J. Mabillon, 9 vols., Paris, 1668–1701
Assyr ... . Assyrian
A. T... ... *Altes Testament*, " Old Testament "
Augs. Con.... Augshurg Confession
A. V... ... Authorized Version (of the English Bible)
AZ..... ... *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Augshurg, Tübingen, Stuttgart, and Tübingen, 1798 sqq.
Baldwin, ... *Dictionary*... J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3 vols. in 4, New York, 1901–05
Benzinger, *Archäologie*. I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1907
Bertholdt, *Einleitung*.... L. Bertholdt, *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung . . des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, 6 vols., Erlangen, 1812–19
BFBS..... ... British and Foreign Bihle Society
Bingham, ... *Origines*. ... J. Bingham, *Origines ecclesiasticæ*, 10 vols., London, 1708–22; new ed., Oxford, 1855
Bouquet, *Recueil* M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, continued hy various hands, 23 vols., Paris, 1738–76
Bower, *Popes*... Archihald Bower, *History of the Popes . . to 1758, continued by S. H. Cox*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1845–47
BQR.. ... ... *Baptist Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia, 1867 sqq.
BRG. ... .See Jaffé
Cant. .. ... Canticles, Song of Solomon
cap .. ... *caput*, " chapter "
Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*... ... R. Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, 16 vols. in 17, Paris, 1858–69
Chron . .. .*Chronicon*, " Chronicle "
I Chron.. .. .. I Chronicles
II Chron ... .. II Chronicles
CIG. .. ... *Corpus inscriptionum Græcarum*, Berlin, 1825 sqq.
CIL. ... ... *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1863 sqq.
CIS. ... ... *Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 sqq.
cod... .. .. .. codex
cod. D..... .. *codex Bezæ*
cod. Theod. .. *codex Theodosianus*
Col.. .. .. .. Epistle to the Colossians
col., cols.. .. .. column, columns
Conf. .. *Confessiones*, " Confessions "
I Cor.. .. First Epistle to the Corinthians
II Cor.. .. Second Epistle to the Corinthians
COT.. ..... See Schrader
CQR.... ... .. *The Church Quarterly Review*, London, 1875 sqq.
CR.... ..... *Corpus reformatorum*, begun at Halle, 1834, vol. lxxxix., Berlin and Leipsic, 1905 sqq.
Creighton, *Papacy*..... M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome*, new ed., 6 vols., New York and London, 1897
CSEL... ... *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna, 1867 sqq.
CSHB.. .. .. *Corpus scriptorum historiæ Byzantinæ*, 49 vols., Bonn, 1828–78
Currier, *Religious Orders*. ... C. W. Currier, *History of Religious Orders*, New York, 1896.
D.... .... Deuteronomist
DACL. ... ... F. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Paris, 1903 sqq.
Dan... ... Daniel
DB.. ... ... J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols. and extra vol., Edinburgh and New York, 1898–1904
DCA... .. W. Smith and S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 2 vols., London, 1875–80
DCB .. .. W. Smith and H. Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 4 vols., Boston, 1877–87
DCG..... J. Hastings, J. A. Selhie, and J. C. Lambert, *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, 2 vols., Edinburgh and New York, 1906–1908.
Deut..... .... Deuteronomy
De vir. ill... .. *De viris illustribus*
De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*.. .. W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel*, vol. i. *A.T.*, ed. E. Schrader, Berlin, 1869
DGQ..... .. See Wattenhach
DNB..... L. Stephen and S. Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols. and supplement 3 vols., London, 1885–1901
Driver, *Introduction*... ... S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 5th ed., New York, 1894
E.. ... ... Elohist
EB..... .. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 4 vols., London and New York, 1899–1903
Eccl... .. ... *Ecclesia*, " Church "; *ecclesiasticus*, " ecclesiastical "
Eccles.... ..... Ecclesiastes
Ecclus .. .... Ecclesiasticus
ed... .. .. .. edition; *edidit*, " edited by "
Eph ... . Epistle to the Ephesians
Epist .... *Epistola, Epistolæ*, " Epistle," " Epistles "
Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*.... .. J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipsic, 1818 sqq.
E. V... .. .... English versions (of the Bihle)
Ex..... .. .. Exodus
Ezek.... .. ... Ezekiel
fasc ... . *fasciculus*
Friedrich, *KD*.. J. Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Bamberg, 1867–69
Fritzsche, *Exegetisches Handbuch*. .. .. O. F. Fritzsche and C. L. W. Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apocryphen des Alten Testaments*, 6 parts, Leipsic, 1851–60
Gal .. .. Epistle to the Galatians
Gams, *Series episcoporum* .. P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, Regensburg, 1873, and supplement, 1886
Gee and Hardy, *Documents* .. H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, London, 1896
Gen. .. .. Genesis

Germ	German
GGA	*Gottingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Göttingen, 1824 sqq.
Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*	E. Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, 7 vols., London, 1896–1900
Gk	Greek, Grecized
Gross, *Sources*	C. Gross, *The Sources and Literature of English History to 1485*, London, 1900
Hab	Habakkuk
Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*	A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1869–78
Hær	Refers to patristic works on heresies or heretics, Tertullian's *De præscriptione*, the *Pros haireseis* of Irenæus, the *Panarion* of Epiphanius, etc.
Hag	Haggai
Harduin, *Concilia*	J. Harduin, *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima*, 12 vols., Paris, 1715
Harnack, *Dogma*	A. Harnack, *History of Dogma from the 3d German edition*, 7 vols., Boston, 1895–1900
Harnack, *Litteratur*	A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 vols. in 3 Leipsic, 1893–1904
Hauck, *KD*	A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1904; vol. ii., 1900; vol. iii., 1906; vol. iv., 1903
Hauck-Herzog, *RE*	*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, founded by J. J. Herzog, 3d ed. by A. Hauck, Leipsic, 1896–1909
Heb	Epistle to the Hebrews
Hebr	Hebrew
Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*	C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, continued by J. Hergenröther, vols. i.–vi., viii.–ix., Freiburg, 1883–93
Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 2d ed. 3 vols., Paderborn, 1907
Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*	P. Helyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires*, 8 vols., Paris, 1714–19; new ed., 1839–42
Henderson, *Documents*	E. F. Henderson. *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, London, 1892
Hist	History, *histoire, historia*
Hist. eccl.	*Historia ecclesiastica, ecclesiæ*, "Church History"
Hom.	*Homilia, homiliai*, "homily, homilies"
Hos	Hosea
Isa	Isaiah
Ital	Italian
J	Jahvist (Yahwist)
JA	*Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1822 sqq.
Jaffé, *BRG*	P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1864–73
Jaffé, *Regesta*	P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum . . . ad annum 1198*, Berlin, 1851; 2d ed., Leipsic, 1881–88
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven, 1849 sqq.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, first appeared as *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Middletown, 1882–88, then Boston, 1890 sqq.
JE	*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols., New York, 1901–06
JE	The combined narrative of the Jahvist (Yahwist) and Elohist
Jer	Jeremiah
Josephus, *Ant*	Flavius Josephus, "Antiquities of the Jews"
Josephus, *Apion*	Flavius Josephus, "Against Apion"
Josephus, *Life*	Life of Flavius Josephus
Josephus, *War*	Flavius Josephus, "The Jewish War"
Josh	Joshua
JPT	*Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq.
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*, London, 1888 sqq.
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*, London, 1899 sqq.
Julian, *Hymnology*	J. Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, revised edition, London, 1907.
JWT	*Jaarboeken voor Wetenschappelijke Theologie*, Utrecht, 1845 sqq.
KAT	See Schrader
KB	See Schrader
KD	See Friedrich, Hauck, Rettberg
KL	*Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon*, 2d ed., by J. Hergenröther and F. Kaulen, 12 vols., Freiburg, 1882–1903
Krüger, *History*	G. Krüger, *History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries*, New York, 1897
Krumbacher, *Geschichte*	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed., Munich, 1897
Labbe, *Concilia*	P. Labbe, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1759–98
Lam	Lamentations
Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist*	J. Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the 13th Century*, 4 vols., Dublin, 1829
Lat	Latin, Latinized
Leg	*Leges, Legum*
Lev	Leviticus
Lichtenberger, *ESR*	F. Lichtenberger, *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, 13 vols., Paris, 1877–1882
Lorenz, *DGQ*	O. Lorenz, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3d ed., Berlin, 1887
LXX	The Septuagint
I Macc	I Maccabees
II Macc	II Maccabees
Mai, *Nova collectio*	A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 10 vols., Rome, 1825–38
Mal	Malachi
Mann, *Popes*	R. C. Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, London, 1902 sqq.
Mansi, *Concilia*	G. D. Mansi, *Sanctorum conciliorum collectio nova*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1728
Matt	Matthew
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniæ historica*, ed. G. H. Pertz and others, Hanover and Berlin, 1826 sqq. The following abbreviations are used for the sections and subsections of this work: *Ant., Antiquitates*, "Antiquities"; *Auct. ant., Auctores antiquissimi*, "Oldest Writers"; *Chron. min., Chronica minora*, "Lesser Chronicles"; *Dip., Diplomata*, "Diplomas, Documents"; *Epist., Epistolæ*, "Letters"; *Gest. pont. Rom., Gesta pontificum Romanorum*, "Deeds of the Popes of Rome"; *Leg., Leges*, "Laws"; *Lib. de lite, Libelli de lite inter regnum et sacerdotium sæculorum xi et xii conscripti*, "Books concerning the Strife between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries"; *Nec., Necrologia Germaniæ*, "Necrology of Germany"; *Poet. Lat. ævi Car., Poetæ Latini ævi Carolini*, "Latin Poets of the Caroline Time"; *Poet. Lat. med. ævi. Poetæ Latini medii ævi*, "Latin Poets of the Middle Ages"; *Script., Scriptores*, "Writers"; *Script. rer. Germ., Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, "Writers on German Subjects"; *Script. rer. Langob., Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*, "Writers on Lombard and Italian Subjects"; *Script. rer. Merov., Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, "Writers on Merovingian Subjects"
Mic	Micah
Milman, *Latin Christianity*	H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity, Including that of the Popes to . . . Nicholas V.*, 8 vols., London, 1860–61
Mirbt, *Quellen*	C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholicismus*, Tübingen, 1901
Moeller, *Christian Church*	W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, 3 vols., London, 1892–1900
MPG	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Græca*, 162 vols., Paris, 1857–66
MPL	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Latinæ*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844–64
MS., MSS	Manuscript, Manuscripts
Muratori, *Scriptores*	L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, 28 vols., 1723–51
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, Hanover, 1876 sqq.
Nah	Nahum
n.d.	no date of publication
Neander, *Christian Church*	A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 6 vols., and index, Boston, 1872–81
Neh	Nehemiah
Niceron, *Mémoires*	R. P. Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres*, 43 vols., Paris, 1729–45
NKZ	*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Leipsic, 1890 sqq.
Nowack, *Archäologie*	W Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1894
n.p.	no place of publication

NPNF... .. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1st series, 14 vols., New York, 1887-92; 2d series, 14 vols., New York, 1890-1900
N. T..... .. New Testament, *Novum Testamentum*, *Nouveau Testament*, *Neues Testament*
Num..... .....Numbers
Ob..... .....Obadiah
O. S. B.... ... *Ordo sancti Benedicti*, "Order of St. Benedict"
O. T.....Old Testament
OTJC..... ....See Smith
P.....Priestly document
Pastor, *Popes*.. L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8 vols., London, 1891–1908
PEA..... ... *Patres ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, ed. J. A. Giles, 34 vols., London, 1838–46
PEF..... .....Palestine Exploration Fund
I Pet..... .....First Epistle of Peter
II Pet..... .....Second Epistle of Peter
Pliny, *Hist. nat*...Pliny, *Historia naturalis*
Potthast, *Wegweiser*... ... A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi. Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke*, Berlin, 1896
Prov... .. ..Proverbs
Ps... ....Psalms
PSBA..... *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology*, London, 1880 sqq.
q.v., qq.v.. .....quod (quæ) vide, "which see"
R..... .....Redactor
Ranke, *Popes*. L. von Ranke, *History of the Popes*, 3 vols., London, 1906
RDM.. .....*Revue des deux mondes*, Paris, 1831 sqq.
RE..... ...See Hauck-Herzog
Reich, *Documents*..... E. Reich, *Select Documents Illustrating Mediæval and Modern History*, London, 1905
REJ.. ....*Revue des études Juives*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Rettberg, *KD*... F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1846–48
Rev.....Book of Revelation
RHR..... .. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Richter, *Kirchenrecht*..... .. A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des katholischen und evangelischen Kirchenrechts*, 8th ed. by W. Kahl, Leipsic, 1886
Robinson, *Researches*, and *Later Researches*..... E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Boston, 1841, and *Later Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 3d ed. of the whole, 3 vols., 1867
Robinson, *European History*.. J. H. Robinson, *Readings in European History*, 2 vols., Boston, 1904–06
Robinson and Beard, *Modern Europe*. J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols., Boston, 1907
Rom.... ....Epistle to the Romans
RSE... ..... *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques*, Arras, 1860–74, Amiens, 1875 sqq.
RTP..... .. *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, Lausanne, 1873
R. V.....Revised Version (of the English Bible)
sæc..... .....*sæculum*, "century"
I Sam.... .....I Samuel
II Sam.....II Samuel
SBA .. .. *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, Berlin, 1882 sqq.
SBE. .... .. F. Max Müller and others, *The Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford, 1879 sqq., vol. xlviii., 1904
SBOT..... *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* ("Rainbow Bible"), Leipsic, London, and Baltimore, 1894 sqq.
Schaff, *Christian Church*... .. P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vols. i.–iv., vi., vii., New York, 1882–92, vol. v., part 1, by D. S. Schaff, 1907
Schaff, *Creeds*.. P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols. New York, 1877–84
Schrader, *COT* E. Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, 2 vols., London, 1885–88
Schrader, *KAT* E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2 vols.. Berlin, 1902–03
Schrader, *KB*.. E. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1889–1901
Schürer, *Geschichte*..... E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., 3 vols., Leipsic, 1902 sqq.; Eng. transl., 5 vols., New York, 1891
Script..... .*Scriptores*, "writers"
Scrivener, *Introduction* . F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction to New Testament Criticism*, 4th ed., London, 1894
Sent..... ....*Sententiæ*, "Sentences"
S. J. .. ..*Societas Jesu*, "Society of Jesus"
SMA .... *Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1860 sqq.
Smith, *Kinship*.. W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, London, 1903
Smith, *OTJC* W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, London, 1892
Smith, *Prophets*.. W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel . . to the Eighth Century*, London, 1895
Smith, *Rel. of Sem*..... W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894
S. P. C. K... .. Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
S. P. G..... Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts
sq., sqq.....and following
Strom.. .. ..*Stromata*, "Miscellanies"
s.v.....sub voce, or sub verbo
Swete, *Introduction*..... ... H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, London, 1900
Syr.. .... .Syriac
TBS ..... .Trinitarian Bible Society
Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*... ..... O. J. Thatcher and E. H. McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History*, New York, 1905
I Thess.....First Epistle to the Thessalonians
II Thess.....Second Epistle to the Thessalonians
ThT .... *Theologische Tijdschrift*, Amsterdam and Leyden, 1867 sqq.
Tillemont, *Mémoires*..... L. S. le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires . . ecclésiastiques des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols., Paris, 1693–1712
I Tim.. ....First Epistle to Timothy
II Tim.... .....Second Epistle to Timothy
TJB.... ..... *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Leipsic, 1882–1887, Freiburg, 1888, Brunswick, 1889–1897, Berlin, 1898 sqq.
TLB..... .. .. *Theologisches Litteraturblatt*, Bonn, 1866 sqq.
TLZ..... *Theologische Litteraturzeitung*, Leipsic, 1876 sqq.
Tob..... .....Tobit
TQ..... *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Tübingen, 1819 sqq.
TS..... J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1891 sqq.
TSBA..... *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, London, 1872 sqq.
TSK..... .. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Hamburg, 1826 sqq.
TU... ..... *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, ed. O. von Gebhardt and A. Harnack, Leipsic, 1882 sqq.
TZT..... .. *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, Tübingen, 1838–40
Ugolini, *Thesaurus*..... .. B. Ugolinus, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, 34 vols., Venice, 1744–69
V T..... ..*Vetus Testamentum*, *Vieux Testament*, "Old Testament"
Wattenbach, *DGQ*.. .. .. W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 5th ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1885; 6th ed., 1893–94
Wellhausen, *Heidentum*... J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin, 1887
Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*... J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th ed., Berlin, 1905, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1885
ZA. ... . *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Leipsic, 1886–88, Berlin, 1889 sqq.
Zahn, *Einleitung* ... T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3d ed., Leipsic, 1907
Zahn, *Kanon*... T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1888–92
ZATW.... ... *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1881 sqq.
ZDAL..... .. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Literatur*, Berlin, 1876 sqq.
ZDMG..... *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipsic, 1847 sqq.
ZDP..... *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Halle, 1869 sqq.
ZDPV.... ... *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, Leipsic, 1878 sqq.
Zech.....Zechariah
Zeph.....Zephaniah
ZHT..... *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, published successively at Leipsic, Hamburg, and Gotha, 1832–75
ZKG..... *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Gotha, 1876 sqq.
ZKR .... *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, Berlin, Tübingen, Freiburg, 1861 sqq.
ZKT..... ... *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1877 sqq.
ZKW..... *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, Leipsic, 1880–89
ZNTW .. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1900 sqq.
ZPK..... *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, Erlangen, 1838–76
ZWT..... .. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jena, 1858–60, Halle, 1861–67, Leipsic, 1868 sqq.

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

The following system of transliteration has been used for Hebrew:

א = ' or omitted at the beginning of a word.	ז = z	ע = ‘
	ח = ḥ	פ = p
ב = b	ט = ṭ	פ = ph or p
ב = bh or b	י = y	צ = ẓ
ג = g	כ = k	ק = ḳ
ג = gh or g	כ = kh or k	ר = r
ד = d	ל = l	שׂ = s
ד = dh or d	מ = m	שׁ = sh
ה = h	נ = n	ת = t
ו = w	ס = s	ת = th or t

The vowels are transcribed by a, e, i, o, u, without attempt to indicate quantity or quality. Arabic and other Semitic languages are transliterated according to the same system as Hebrew. Greek is written with Roman characters, the common equivalents being used.

KEY TO PRONUNCIATION

When the pronunciation is self-evident the titles are not respelled; when by mere division and accentuation it can be shown sufficiently clearly the titles have been divided into syllables, and the accented syllables indicated.

ɑ as in sof*a*	ɵ as in n*o*t	iu as in d*u*ration
ɑ̄ " " *a*rm	ō " " n*o*r	c = k " " *c*at
a " " *a*t	u " " f*u*ll[2]	ch " " *ch*urch
ā " " f*a*re	ū " " r*u*le	cw = qu as in *qu*een
e " " p*e*n[1]	ʊ " " b*u*t	dh (*th*) " " *th*e
ê " " f*a*te	ʊ̄ " " b*u*rn	f " " *f*ancy
i " " t*i*n	ɑi " " p*i*ne	g (hard) " " *g*o
î " " mach*i*ne	ɑu " " *ou*t	ʜ " " lo*ch* (Scotch)
o " " *o*bey	ɵi " " *oi*l	hw (*wh*) " " *wh*y
ō " " n*o*	iū " " f*ew*	j " " *j*aw

[1] In accented syllables only; in unaccented syllables it approximates the sound of e in ov*e*r. The letter n̤, with a dot beneath it, indicates the sound of n as in i*n*k. Nasal n (as in French words) is rendered n.

[2] In German and French names ü approximates the sound of u in d*u*ne.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

DRAESEKE, drê-sî'ke, **JOHANN HEINRICH BERNHARD:** German preacher; b. at Brunswick Jan. 18, 1774; d. at Potsdam Dec. 8, 1849. He studied at the University of Helmstädt, where he was influenced by humanitarianism rather than by rationalism, and during this period wrote a drama which was produced at Dresden, while in his *Das Heilige auf der Bühne* (1817) he defended the representation of sacred subjects on the stage. At the age of twenty-one he was called as deacon to Mölln, being made preacher three years later, and being appointed pastor of Ratzeburg in 1804. There he published his *Predigten für denkende Verehrer Jesu* (5 vols., Lüneburg, 1804–12) and his catechetical *Glaube, Liebe und Hoffnung* (1813), while his patriotic sermons caused such excitement that he narrowly escaped arrest by French troops. In 1814 he was called to Bremen, and to this period belong his *Predigten über Deutschlands Wiedergeburt* (3 vols., Lüneburg, 1814); *Predigt-Entwürfe über freie Texte* (2 vols., Bremen, 1815); *Ueber die letzten Schicksale unseres Herrn* (2 vols., Lüneburg, 1816); *Ueber frei gewählte Abschnitte der heiligen Schrift* (4 vols., 1817–18); *Christus an das Geschlecht dieser Zeit* (1819); *Gemälde aus der heiligen Schrift* (4 vols., 1821–28); and *Vom Reich Gottes, Betrachtungen nach der heiligen Schrift* (3 vols., Bremen, 1830). The political tone of his sermons, however, caused many of them to be suppressed by the authorities. His addresses on the kingdom of God, on the other hand, attracted the attention of Frederick William III., and when Westermaier, bishop of Saxony, died in 1832, Dräseke was appointed to fill the vacancy. As bishop he gained wide popularity by his eloquence, impartiality, and geniality. Avoiding the extremes of rationalism, on the one hand, and Pietism, on the other, he was welcomed as a true Evangelical. The year 1840, however, brought an eventful change, when the assertion of a rationalistic pastor named Sintenis that prayer should not be offered to Christ forced Dräseke to take a decided stand. The government checked the episcopal protest, but the rationalistic attacks were pushed so far that Dräseke felt that his usefulness was at an end. In 1843 the king permitted him to resign, and he spent the remainder of his life in Potsdam. The only occasion on which he came again before the public was in 1845, when he signed the protest of Sydow, Jonas, and others against the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. His *Nachgelassene Schriften* were edited by T. H. T. Dräseke (2 vols., Magdeburg, 1850–51).

The earliest theological position of Dräseke was the humanism of Herder on a Pelagian basis, where Christianity was merely the highest product of the human race; but gradually he attained a more positive attitude, and a deeper insight into the depths of the soul. As a preacher he must be reckoned among the foremost of German pulpit-orators, rising from restriction to the higher cultivated classes to a more popular and intelligible style which attracted all types of men.

(AUGUST THOLUCK†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His life is in *ADB*, v. 373 sqq.

DRAGON: A mythical creature, belief in the existence of which is attested by the folk-lore and literature of nearly all nations, ancient and modern. The creature is usually, but not always, pictured as a modified serpent, with legs and feet terminating in talon-like claws, and it is generally regarded as hostile to gods and the human species. Its habitat is variously described: in the heaven, where it often is regarded as causing the eclipse of the sun and the moon; on the earth, where it inhabits deserts, mountain recesses, and places nearly or quite inaccessible to man; and the sea, whence it issues to work evil or to receive an offering which alone averts its anger and the destruction consequent upon this (cf. the Greek story of Perseus). As an agent of evil it is sometimes assigned in myths to the guardianship of things precious or under the care of wizards, witches, or wonder-workers (cf. the Greek story of Medea and the Golden Fleece). By a transformation not usual in the development of religion, it sometimes attains to a position of honor in the religion of the people and becomes beneficent (as in China), and indeed receives worship and honor (cf. Bel and the Dragon, which, though unhistorical, yet attests the possibility of existence of such a cult; see APOCRYPHA, A, IV., 3). Tiamat, the representative of chaos in Babylonian mythology, is perhaps the earliest form in which this belief has gained mention in extant literature; the dragon-character of Tiamat hardly admits of question, in spite of the doubts of Baudissin (Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, v. 4 sqq.), based largely on the fact that serpentine form was not given to this creature in the monuments—the character of hostility to the gods is well marked. The existence of belief in dragons in other Semitic realms is easily susceptible of

proof (cf. Baudissin, ut sup., and the references there given). A similar belief entered the folk- and church-lore of Christians; and just as the heroes and demigods of classic or Teutonic story (Perseus, Siegfried, Beowulf) were credited with combat against, and mastery over dragons, so were heroes of Christian story (St. George, St. Sylvester).

In the Old Testament the Authorized Version translates four Hebrew words by this term, and in the New Testament dragon is the rendering of the Gk. *drakōn* in Rev. xii., xiii. 2, 4, 11, xvi. 13, xx. 2. The four Hebrew words are: (1) the masculine plural *tannim* (from an assumed singular *tan*), "howlers," occurring in Job xxx. 29; Ps. xliv. 19; Isa. xiii. 22, xxxiv. 13, xxxv. 7, xliii. 20; Jer. ix, 11, x. 22, xiv. 6, xlix. 33, li. 37; Mic. i. 8, in the A. V uniformly translated "dragon," but rendered in the R.V. "jackals"; (2) the feminine plural *tannoth* (Mal. i. 3), from the same singular or an assumed *tannah*, translated "dragons" in the A.V. and "jackals" in the R. V.; (3) the singular *tannim* (regarded as a mistake for *tannin*, see below, which is found in some manuscripts), occurring only in Ezek. xxix. 3, A. V. and R. V. "dragon," and xxxii. 2, A. V. "whale," margin and R. V "dragon" (possibly meaning the crocodile); (4) the singular *tannin*, plural *tanninim*, occurring Deut. xxxii. 33; Neh. ii. 13; Ps. lxxiv. 13, xci. 13, xclviii. 7; Isa. xxvii. 1; Jer. li. 34 The R. V. follows the A. V. in rendering "dragon," except in Ps. lxxiv. 13 and cxlviii. 7, margin, where it has "sea monsters," and Ps. xci. 13, where it has "serpent." This same word is in Gen. i. 21 and Job vii. 12 rendered by A. V "whale," by R. V. "sea monster"; in Ex. vii. 9, 10, 12 both A. V and R. V. have "serpent"; in Lam. iv. 3 A. V has "sea monsters" and R. V "jackals." The nearly uniform rendering in the A. V follows closely that of the Septuagint, which translates all cases by *drakōn* except Gen. i. 21, where *kētos*, "whale," is found. This rendering doubtless originated in confusion between words from two roots, one of which meant "to howl," and the other probably "to be extended." Modern investigation has revealed this distinction, which is probably accurately reflected in the R. V. There is some question whether "wolf" would not in some passages be more accurate than "jackal." The word is employed metaphorically (e.g., Isa. li. 9), and also with mythological reference (Isa. xxvii. 1, and the passages in the New Testament). Neither of these usages is present in the apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon, which is simply a Haggadic story. Job xxvi. 13 is probably a reminiscence of belief in the dragon as an inhabitant of the heavens, while Amos ix. 3 exhibits the belief in the creature as existing in the sea.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For a review of the legends centering about the dragon nothing is better than E. S. Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, 3 vols., London, 1894–96. Consult further: P. Lerch, in *Orient und Occident*, i. 4, pp. 751–754, Göttingen, 1862; W. W. von Baudissin, *Semitische Religionsgeschichte*, i. 255–292, Leipsic, 1876; G. A. Barton, in *JAOS*, xv. 1 (1891), 23–24; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 69 sqq., 320–323, Göttingen, 1895; Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 176; *DB*, i. 620–621, ii. 526; *EB*, i. 1131–1134, ii. 2305–06; *JE*, iv. 647–648; and the later commentaries on the passages cited in the text.

DRAGONADES. See HUGUENOTS; NÎMES, EDICT OF.

DRANE, AUGUSTA THEODOSIA (Sister Francis Raphael): English Dominican; b. at Bromley St. Leonard's (a suburb of London), Middlesex, Dec. 28, 1823; d. at Stone (7 m. n.n.w. of Stafford), Staffordshire, Apr. 29, 1894. She was educated privately, and until the age of twenty-seven was a member of the Church of England. Carried beyond the Tractarian movement, however, she became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church in 1850, and after a residence of six months at Rome, 1851–52, she was received as a postulant in the Dominican convent at Clifton Oct. 4, 1852. She became a professed at Stone, where the convent had meantime been transferred, in 1856, and from 1872 to 1881 was prioress of the convent. From 1881 until within three weeks of her death she was mother provincial of the Order. She was the author of a large number of books (many of them published anonymously), including *The Morality of Tractarianism* (London, 1850); *Catholic Legends and Stories* (1855); *The Life of St. Dominic, with a Sketch of the Dominican Order* (1857); *The Knights of St. John, with the Battle of Lepanto and the Siege of Vienna* (1858); *Memoir of Sister Mary Philomena Berkeley, Religious of the Third Order of St. Dominic* (1860); *Christian Schools and Scholars, or Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent* (1867); *Life of Mother Margaret Hallahan* (1869); *The History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions* (1880); *The History of St. Dominic, Founder of the Friar Preachers* (1891); *Catholic Readers* (5 vols., 1891); and *The Spirit of the Dominican Order, illustrated from the Lives of its Saints* (1896). She translated P. Chocarne's *Le Révérend Père H. D. Lacordaire de l'ordre des Frères prêcheurs, sa vie intime et religieuse* (London, 1868), and edited *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne* (1891) and *Letters of Archbishop Ullathorne* (1892).

DREAMS: Dreams are commonly considered in all religions a means of revelation. The strange, wonderful, but often lively phenomena of dream life, sundered at the time from conscious knowledge and thought, are accepted as prophetic revelations of divinity to the sleeper. Consequently men endeavor to induce prophetic dreams by sleeping in places supposed to be favorable or by taking potions. Such practises were followed by Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Chinese, Greeks, Romans, Germans, and many other peoples. But, since the dream pictures were often obscure, there grew up the art of interpreting dreams, while still there was often the acknowledgment that these means were delusive. In the Bible dreams appear as a means by which God speaks to man, warns him of danger, imparts knowledge, gives counsel, and directs for the future. Such dreams of instruction have been known in all times as in the present, for why should not God choose this method of communication with mankind? In the dream the inner life is often more strongly impressed than is possible under ordinary conditions, the consciousness is

more easily reached than when the press of thoughts interrupts communication. In Biblical cases the suspicion of deception is excluded partly by the extraordinary divine force of the impression, partly by its appeal to the conscience; on the other hand, the dream is often represented as a vain and empty thing (Job. xx. 8; Ps. lxxiii. 20). Symbolic dreams are also known to the Bible, the meaning of which is not attainable to the worldly-wise, but only to those to whom God has granted the gift of interpretation. Such dreams came to a Joseph and a Daniel. While many examples confirm the use of the dream as a means of revelation, it is not for the people of God the only means, and it is, besides, used as a medium by which God comes into contact with other than his own people. There were other means of self-revelation of God, however, especially in the word of the prophets who often received their oracles while in possession of full consciousness. A species of revelation standing midway between these two was the dream-vision (Job iv. 13–21). To this class belong the experiences of Solomon (I Kings iii. 5) and Daniel (Dan. vii. 1). The prophets generally do not speak of dreams as the source of their inspiration, and the Arabs distinguish between prophetic insight and the dream. Zechariah's vision (Zech. i. 8 sqq.) was not a dream (cf. iv. 1). Jeremiah speaks of the misuse of dreams and disparages them (Jer. xxiii. 25 sqq.) on the ground that they are often the product of the wish of the heart. Deut. xiii. 2 sqq. gives a criterion for the testing of prophetic dreams. The later Jews paid much attention to these phenomena, and the Essenes seem to have done the same (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVII. xiii. 3). See DIVINATION. (C. VON ORELLI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Knobel, *Prophetismus der Hebräer*, i. 174 sqq., Breslau, 1837; F. Delitzsch, *Biblische Psychologie*, pp. 233 sqq., Leipsic, 1861, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1867; W. B. Carpenter, *Mental Physiology*, London, 1876; F. E. König, *Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T.*, ii. 9 sqq., 63 sqq., Leipsic, 1882; G. F. Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.*, pp. 216 sqq., 743 sqq., Stuttgart, 1882, Eng. transl., New York, 1883; C. von Orelli, *Alttestamentliche Weissagungen*, pp. 17–18, Vienna, 1882, Eng. transl., *Old Testament Prophecy*, Edinburgh, 1885; E. Clodd, *Myths and Dreams*, London, 1885; H. Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Göttingen, 1888, Eng. transl., London, 1892; J. W. Reynolds, *Natural Hist. of Immortality*, pp. 124–139, ib. 1891; *DB*, i. 622–623; *EB*, i. 1118–19.

DRELINCOURT, drê″laṅ″cūr′, **CHARLES**: French Reformed pastor; b. at Sédan July 10, 1595; d. in Paris Nov. 3, 1669. He was educated at Sédan and Saumur, and was pastor of the Reformed Church of Charenton, near Paris, from 1620 to his death. He was a prolific writer, and two of his works achieved extraordinary success: *Consolations de l'âme fidèle contre les frayeurs de la mort*, reprinted, in more than forty editions, as late as Nîmes, 1819, Eng. transl., *The Christian's Defence against the Fears of Death* (4th ed., London, 1701; 27th ed., Liverpool, 1810; the sale of the translation is said to have been promoted by Defoe's *True Relation of the Apparition of one Mrs. Veal the Next Day after her Death to one Mrs. Bargrave at Canterbury the 8th of September, 1705*, London, 1706, in which the dead lady recommended Drelincourt's book. Defoe's work is included in many editions of the translation). Drelincourt's other important work was *Visites charitables ou consolations chrétiennes pour toutes les personnes affligées* (5 vols., Charenton, 1669, and often, translated into six languages). In English the work appeared in five small volumes, each devoted to a visit upon a particular class of afflicted persons (London, 1785).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A Memoir is affixed to the ninth and subsequent editions of *The Christian's Defence*, London, 1719. Consult E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. H. L. Bordier, Paris, 1877–86 (contains imperfect list of his writings); Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 81–84.

DRESS AND ORNAMENT, HEBREW.

The Apron or Girdle (§ 1).
The Coat or Cloak (§ 2).
Women's Attire (§ 3).
The Head-dress (§ 4).
Foot-wear (§ 5).
Signets and Seals (§ 6).
Charms (§ 7).
Earrings and Nose-rings (§ 8).
Ornaments for Head and Neck (§ 9).
The Hair (§ 10).
The Beard (§ 11).

In the Old Testament there is no description of clothing and articles of adornment. The archeologist, therefore, has to rely upon ancient Egyptian and Babylonian-Assyrian portraiture and observation of present customs. The most ancient article of dress was the apron or girdle (*ezor*, *ḥagor*, *saḳ*), a simple piece of cloth (Jer. xiii. 1) or leather (II Kings i. 8) thrown about the loins.

1. The Apron or Girdle.

In all periods it was the most usual garment in Egypt, though of course its form was often modified. In Egyptian pictures it appears also as the dress of the Bedouin; and it has been preserved in the *iḥrām* worn by pilgrims in Mecca. The Old Testament mentions the girdle as worn by Assyrian warriors (Isa. v. 27; Ezek. xxiii. 15). Among the Israelites the girdle survived as the dress of those consecrated to God (II Kings i. 8; Isa. xx. 2; Jer. xiii. 1 sqq.) and as the vestment of the high priest. As *saḳ* it was worn for mourning (see MOURNING CUSTOMS, HEBREW), either alone or under another garment (II Kings vi. 30). Otherwise the *kuttoneth*, or shirt, took the place of the girdle. In Assyrian art this appears as a tight-fitting undergarment, sometimes reaching only to the knee, sometimes to the ankle. It corresponded to the undergarment of the fellah of to-day: a rough cotton tunic of a faded blue color, open at the breast, with loose sleeves and a girdle around the hips to hold the garment out of the way in walking or working. Such must have been the Hebrew *kuttoneth*, though it reached only to the knees. The longer coat, with long sleeves, was especially for women, being unusual for men (Gen. xxxvii. 3; II Sam. xiii. 18). A still finer garment was the *sadin*, a linen shirt that the well-to-do wore under the *kuttoneth* (Judges xiv. 12; Prov. xxxi. 24; Isa. iii. 23). It was of Canaanitic origin and is mentioned in the Amarna tablets.

The *simla*, or overdress, had various forms. Egyptian representations of Bedouins show it as a loose wrap that leaves one shoulder and both arms free. It was a heavy shawl, such as is still found among Bedouins. The ancient Babylonians wore a similar garment. Among the Hebrews this was probably the mantle of the common people; later it developed into the present *abaye*, the mantle of the fellahs and Bedouin. This is a large quadran-

gular piece of rough, heavy woolen material, crudely sewed together so that holes are left for the arms.

2. The Coat or Cloak.

Like the *abaye*, the *simla* was not worn at work (Matt. xxiv. 18); but it was similarly useful. All kinds of articles could be carried in it, e.g. barley, wood, grass, etc. (Ex. xii. 34; Judges viii 25; II Kings iv 39). By day it was a protection against rain and cold, by night it served as bed and cover (Ex. xxii. 26; Deut. xxiv. 12 sqq.). No respectable man went without this overdress (Amos ii. 16; Isa. xx. 2–3). From this simple garment was developed the richly ornamented mantle of well-to-do Assyrians and Babylonians, which reached from the neck to the knees and had short sleeves. Canaanites of the better classes wore a strip of heavy fancy-colored cloth wrapped around the body several times. This was embroidered in colors and finished with fringe. The Israelites, who had a taste for gorgeous colors (Josh. vii. 21; Judges v. 30; II Sam. i. 24), probably adopted from the Canaanites certain overgarments called *me'il* and *addereth*. The first was a costly wrap (I Sam. ii. 19, xviii 4, xxiv. 5, 11), and, according to the description of the priest's *me'il*, was similar to the sleeveless *abaye* (Ex. xxviii. 31 sqq.; Josephus, *Ant.*, III. vii. 4). The *addereth* was an extra robe worn over the *simla* (Mic. ii. 8), similar to the gorgeous Babylonian robe for which the same name was employed (Josh. vii. 21; Jonah iii. 6). The leather garment worn by the prophets was called by the same name because of its width.

A woman's dress evidently differed from that of a man (Deut. xxii. 5), but consisted likewise of *simla* and *kuttoneth*. Presumably these garments had sleeves and were longer than those worn by men, were also of finer material, of brighter colors, and more richly ornamented. The *sadin*, the finer linen underdress, was also worn by women (Isa. iii. 23; Prov. xxxi. 24). Further, mention is made of the *miṭpaḥaṭh*, a kind of veil or shawl

3. Women's Attire.

(Ruth iii. 15); and the *ma'aṭapha*, a wrap of unknown form (Isa. iii. 22).

A very important article of female attire was the veil. The use of the veil by the bride (Gen. xxiv. 65) and in other cases (Gen. xxxviii. 14; Ruth iii. 3) is traceable to the influence of the Ishtar myth. The veil was the symbol of Ishtar, who, on coming from the underworld, walked out veiled to meet Tammuz, her bridegroom. Otherwise it was not customary for women to go veiled (Gen. xii. 14, xxiv. 15 sqq.), contrary to present custom in the Orient due to the influence of Islam. The veil of the ordinary woman's wardrobe was a neckcloth. According to ancient statuary, it reached from the forehead down across the back of the head to the hips or still lower, and was not unlike the neckerchief of the peasant woman in modern Palestine. It is not known how the various kinds of veils mentioned in the Old Testament differed from one another (Gen. xxiv. 65; Cant. iv. 3; Isa. iii. 19 sqq., xlvii. 2). The increasing luxury of women in the matter of dress is shown by the enumeration of the articles of a woman's toilet in Isa. iii. 18–23.

As regards head-dress, some representations show Jews and Syrians bareheaded, others show them wearing merely a band to hold the hair together. This last is still occasionally seen in Arabia. The usual head-covering of the Bedouin of to-day is the *keffiye*, a large square piece of woolen cloth

4. The Head-dress.

folded diagonally, then thrown over the head in such a way that the loose corners of the triangle protect the back of the head and neck, while the other two corners are tied under the chin and then thrown across the shoulders. A strong wool cord holds the cloth securely on the head. Hebrew peasants undoubtedly wore a similar head-dress. The better classes, both men and women, wore a kind of turban, i.e., a cloth wound about the head. The shape of this varied greatly, depending upon the way it was adjusted, just as the head-dress of to-day varies in different localities. The turban of the high priest, the *miẓnepheth*, had a special form (Ex. xxviii. 40), as did that of the priest, the *migba'a* or *pe'er* (Ex. xxviii. 40, xxxix. 28). The *pe'er* was afterward worn by men and women of the better classes (Isa. iii. 20; Ezek. xxiv. 17); for instance, by the bridegroom on the wedding day (Isa. lxi. 10). The high conical turbans seen in pictures of Assyrian kings and priests may be regarded as good examples of this variety of head-covering.

The use of sandals among the Egyptians became common in the middle kingdom, universal in the new kingdom. On Babylonian and Assyrian monuments even kings appear barefooted. Other representations show sandals with a strap stretched across the foot from the side, and often with a leather strap between the toes and drawn across the foot longitudinally. Later Assyrian soldiers wore a kind of leather boot, made of pieces of leather tied

5. Footwear.

about the foot and reaching above the ankle. By soldiers of to-day pointed shoes are worn over the sandals, affording protection to the toes in mountainous districts. Among the Israelites the common man usually went barefooted, as does the fellah of to-day, though he sometimes had sandals (Amos ii. 6, viii. 6). These were of leather or wood, with leather straps (Gen. xiv. 23; Isa. v. 27). They were not worn in the house nor in the sanctuary (Ex. iii. 5, xii. 11; Josh. v. 15). The priests performed their duties barefooted. In mourning, also, it was customary to go barefooted (II Sam. xv. 30; Ezek. xxiv. 17, 23). Jewelry was much worn in the ancient Orient, as it is to-day. A cane and a signet-ring belonged to the equipment of a Babylonian, and were usual articles of personal adornment (cf. Herodotus, i. 195, and Strabo, xvi. 746). The cane was often a necessity, as in the case of the shepherd; otherwise it was a valuable weapon. In modern times it is not used as a support in walking—it being too short for that purpose—but is carried thrown across the shoulder.

The signet-ring (*ḥotham*) is quite ancient and is supposed to have been worn even by the patriarchs. The impression of such a ring serves in place of the written signature, hence its importance and the universality of its use. At first these rings were not worn on the finger, but were carried on a cord

tied around the neck (Gen. xxxviii. 18), as still is often the case. The Egyptians wore the signet on the finger (Gen. xli. 42), and later the Israelites wore it on a finger of the right hand (Jer. xxii. 24). Besides the signet-ring set with a cut stone, the signet took the form of a cylinder. This kind of seal was common in Babylon, and, as excavations have shown, was in use in Palestine. From remotest antiquity Babylonia was distinguished for gem-cutting, an art which reached there a high degree of excellence shown by the exquisitely carved cylinders that have been preserved. This art was introduced into Syria. A seal-cylinder found at Taanach shows Babylonian and Egyptian characters, thus betraying its Western origin. It is not known to what extent such things were made in Israel, or whether they were not bought through the Phenicians. At all events, in decorative art and in the manner of execution Babylonian influence was always dominant. The handsomest seal extant by a Hebrew hand is one that was discovered in Megiddo by the excavations of the Deutscher Palästina-Verein. It is the seal of Shemai, the minister of state (*ebed*) of Jeroboam II., made of jasper, oval in form, 3.7 by 2.7 centimeters, and with a splendidly carved lion, resembling closely the lion figures of Babylonian-Assyrian art (cf. *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1904, pp. 1 sqq.).

6. Signets and Seals.

A jewel was at the same time an amulet. According to the ancient Oriental view, metals and precious stones belonged to certain gods of the mineral world, and possessed, therefore, a mysterious magic power. Aside from this, any trinket that diverts attention from the wearer to itself still serves as a protection against the evil eye. For this reason every one in the Orient wears an abundance of jewelry. Traces of this superstition are found in the Old Testament. In Isa. iii. 20 a piece of woman's jewelry is designated as an amulet (cf. Gen. xxxv. 4); and it is evident that the ornaments on the camels of the Midianites were charms (Judges viii. 21). In design and execution the various articles of jewelry resemble Babylonian and Egyptian models.

7. Charms.

Earrings were the principal article of jewelry for women (Gen. xxxv. 4), and were sometimes worn by children (Ex. xxxii. 2). They were also worn by men, e.g., by the Midianites (Judges viii. 24 sqq.), and Pliny claims that they were worn by all Orientals (Pliny, xi. 136). It is impossible to distinguish the various kinds of earrings mentioned; still, the excavations at Gezer, Megiddo, and Taanach have brought to light several characteristic forms (cf. PEF, *Quarterly Statement*, 1903, p. 202). Nose-rings were also quite popular (Gen. xxiv. 22, 47; Isa. iii. 21), finger-rings were less usual. Finally, the toes were also ornamented with rings.

8. Earrings and Nose-rings.

The forehead and hair were beautified by bands of gold or silver ornaments (Isa. iii. 18); and necklaces of various kinds were worn, also strings of rings, pearls, small glass cylinders, bone buttons, metal pendants, etc., were worn around the neck. Excavations have revealed a great variety of such articles. Particularly popular as amulet and bangle were the scarabs, imitations of the sacred dor-beetle which originated in Egypt. They spread all over the Orient; and excavations in the South (e.g., at Gezer) have brought numbers of them to light. Bracelets were simply pieces of wire bent around the arms, and the ends were not fastened together (Gen. xxiv. 22; Ezek. xvi. 13, xxiii. 42). There were also anklets of corresponding form, to which were sometimes attached small chains (Isa. iii. 18). This kind of jewelry for women is peculiar to the Orient, both ancient and modern.

9. Ornaments for Head and Neck.

As to the care of the hair, the custom of shaving the head, wide-spread in ancient Egypt and still common, was prohibited in Israel (Lev. xix. 27; Deut. xiv. 1) because it often had a religious significance. However, as a sign of mourning this custom, perhaps universal in the oldest period, was preserved despite the prohibition (Ezek. vii. 18; Amos viii. 10; Mic. i. 16). Priests were commanded to keep their hair cut properly, and not to allow it to grow unrestrained (Ezek. xliv. 20); but no shears were to touch the head of the Nazirite (Num. vi. 18; Judges xiii. 5; I Sam. i. 11). The Egyptian way of dressing the hair with wigs and other artificial accessories was never imitated in anterior Asia. According to ancient Egyptian representations, the Syrian wore his hair rather long. The front hair was brushed down over the forehead; otherwise the hair was caught up in tufts behind, which stood out from the head. Assyrian monuments show long hair worn in plaits hanging about the neck as the prevailing style, and suggest that the better classes paid much attention to the dressing of the hair and beard. For a woman long hair was essential to beauty (Cant. iv. 1, and often); and a bald head was the greatest affliction (Isa. iii. 24). To let the hair down and allow it to hang in disorder denoted extreme humility (Num. v. 18; cf. Luke vii. 38). The arts employed by women to beautify the hair are derided by Isaiah (Isa. iii. 24).

10. The Hair.

For the Egyptians a beard was something too repulsive to be allowed, accordingly they kept themselves shaved; but the "barbarians" allowed their beards to grow. In Egyptian pictures the Syrians have round beards, the Bedouins pointed beards. Assyrian representations testify to the custom of wearing a mustache. To cut off any one's beard was a grave insult (II Sam. x. 4), a humiliation to which prisoners of war were subjected (Isa. vii. 20); and often, in deep mourning, this mutilation was self-inflicted (Isa. xv. 2). To cut out the corners of the beard was forbidden in Israel, as being the custom of a strange cult.

11. The Beard.

I. Benzinger.

Bibliography: H. Weiss, *Kostümkunde*, part i., *Die Völker des Ostens*, Stuttgart, 1860; B. Ugolini, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxix., 34 vols., Venice, 1744–69; A. T. Hartmann, *Die Hebräerin am Putztisch und als Braut*, Amsterdam, 1809; W. M. Thompson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols., New York, 1880–86; I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, § § 16–17, Tübingen, 1907; W.

Nowack, *Hebräische Archäologie*, §§ 20–21, Freiberg, 1894; H. B. Tristram, *Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*, pp. 155–176, London, 1894; *DB*, i. 623–629; *EB*, i. 1135 sqq.

DREWS, PAUL GOTTFRIED: German Protestant; b. at Eibenstock (60 m. s.e. of Leipsic) May 8, 1858. He studied at Leipsic and Göttingen 1878–81, and after being a private tutor became a member of the clergy staff of St. Pauli in Leipsic in 1883. He was pastor at Burkau 1883–89, and at Dresden 1889–94. In 1894 he became professor extraordinary of homiletics and catechetics at Jena, in 1901 professor of practical theology at Giessen, and in 1908 he accepted a call to the University of Halle. He has written *Willibald Pirkheimers Stellung zur Reformation* (Leipsic, 1887); *Humanismus und Reformation* (1887); *Christus, unser Leben* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1894–1901); *Disputationen Dr. Martin Luthers in den Jahren 1535 bis 1545 an der Universität Wittenberg gehalten* (1895); *Das kirchliche Leben der evangelisch-lutherischen Landeskirche des Königreichs Sachsen* (vol. i. of his *Evangelische Kirchenkunde;* Tübingen, 1902); *Studien zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes und des gottesdienstlichen Lebens* (3 parts, 1902–06); *Die Ordination, Lehrverpflichtung und Prüfung der Ordinanden in Wittenberg 1535* (Giessen, 1904); *Der evangelische Geistliche in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Jena, 1905); and *Der Einfluss der gesellschaftlichen Zustände auf das kirchliche Leben* (Tübingen, 1906). He has likewise been a joint editor of the *Monatsschrift für die kirchliche Praxis* since 1901.

DREY, JOHANN SEBASTIAN VON: Roman Catholic; b. at Killingen (near Ellwangen, 45 m. e.n.e. of Stuttgart) Oct. 16, 1777; d. at Tübingen Feb. 19, 1853. He studied theology at Augsburg, was ordained priest in 1801, and in 1812 was appointed professor of theology at Ellwangen. When this institution was disbanded in 1817 he became professor at Tübingen, holding this position till 1846, when he retired. With his colleagues Gratz, Herbst, and Hirscher he founded the *Theologische Quartalschrift* in 1819. His principal work was on Christian apologetics (2 vols., Mainz, 1838–43; 2d ed. enlarged, 3 vols., 1847).

DRISCOLL, JAMES FRANCIS: Roman Catholic; b. at East Poultney, Vt., Sept. 30, 1859. He studied at Montreal College (B.A., Laval University, 1881), the Grand Séminaire, Montreal (1881–84), the Séminaire St. Sulpice, Paris (1884–1886; bachelor of theology and canon law, Institut Catholique, Paris, 1886), Minerva University, Rome (1886–88), Università Reale, Rome (1886–1888), New York University (1897–1900), Johns Hopkins University (1901–02), and the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. (1901–1902). He was professor of dogmatic theology and Hebrew in the Theological Seminary of Montreal (1889–96), professor of the same subjects in St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y. (1896–99), and of Holy Scripture and Hebrew in the same institution (1899–1901), professor of Scripture in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md. (1901–02), and at the same time professor of Semitic languages in St. Austin's College, Washington, D. C. Since 1902 he has been president and professor of moral theology in St. Joseph's Seminary. He was chairman of the Seminary Board in the annual conference for the promotion of Catholic education in 1905–06. In theological position he is "Roman Catholic, but of liberal progressive views—frankly welcoming all the reasonably established claims of modern scholarship in the field of science, philosophy, historical and Biblical criticism, etc." He has been editor of *The New York Review* since 1905.

DRIVER, SAMUEL ROLLES: Church of England; b. at Southampton Oct. 2, 1846. He studied at Winchester College and New College, Oxford (B.A., 1869), where he was fellow 1870–82 and tutor 1875–82. Since 1882 he has been regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church, Oxford. He was a member of the Old Testament Revision Company 1876–84, and examining chaplain to the bishop of Southwell 1884–1904. He has written *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (London, 1874); *Isaiah: Life, Times, and Writings which bear his Name* (1888); *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1890); *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, 1891); *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament* (London, 1892); *Deuteronomy* (1895); and *Authority and Archæology, Sacred and Profane* (in collaboration with D. G. Hogarth; 1899). He also edited the commentary of Moses ben Shesheth on Jeremiah and Ezekiel (London, 1871); *The Holy Bible, with various Renderings and Readings from the best Authorities* (1876); *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters* (in collaboration with A. D. Neubauer; 1877); *The Book of Proverbs attributed to Abraham ibn Ezra* (1880); *Leviticus*, in *The Polychrome Bible* (2 vols., 1894–97); *The Parallel Psalter* (1898); *Daniel, Joel, and Amos*, in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools* (Cambridge, 1900–01); *Genesis*, in *The Westminster Commentaries* (London, 1904); *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua*, in R. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (Leipsic, 1905); *The Minor Prophets*, in *The Century Bible* (London, 1906); *The Book of Job* (1906); and *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (1906). He likewise collaborated with F. Brown and C. A. Briggs in *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (12 parts, Oxford, 1892–1905), and was a member of the editorial board of J. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1898–1904) and of the *Studia Biblica* (Oxford, 1885 sqq.).

DROSTE-VISCHERING, drōs'tê-fish'er-ing.

Activity at Münster (§ 1).
Mixed Marriages (§ 2).
Archbishop of Cologne (§ 3).
The University of Bonn (§ 4).
Droste-Vischering's Downfall (§ 5).

Clemens August, Freiherr von Droste-Vischering, archbishop of Cologne, was born at Münster Jan. 21, 1773; d. there Oct. 19, 1845. Descended from a strict Roman Catholic family, he was ordained priest in 1798, and in 1810 became coadjutor to the acting bishop of Münster, who was ill and died Sept. 16. Droste-Vischering was elected his successor, but when Münster came under French rule in the same year the existing diocesan ad-

ministration was abolished by Napoleon, Droste-Vischering was thrust aside, and the dean of the cathedral, Count Spiegel, was appointed bishop and commissioned to administer the diocese as vicar of the chapter until he should be canonically instituted. As Droste-Vischering already occupied this office, and as after the restoration of Prussian rule in Münster the Napoleonic changes were rescinded, Spiegel ultimately had to yield and in 1815 Droste-Vischering undertook once more, as vicar of the chapter, the management of the diocese.

1. Activity at Muenster.

Even thus early he stood for principles concerning the relations of Church and State which were quite impracticable in a land where the confessions lived side by side. He was not satisfied with proposing in his publication *Ueber die Religionsfreiheit der Katholiken* (Münster, 1817) an impossible platform for church politics, but endeavored to put it in practise, and thus came into conflict with the Prussian government, at first on the question of mixed marriages, then by an attempt to cripple the theological faculty in Bonn. In 1819 he instructed the priests to refuse to perform mixed marriages unless the parties should promise to educate their children in the Roman Catholic faith; and he forbade students of theology to follow Georg Hermes (q.v.) from Münster to Bonn, and declared he would ordain no one who attended lectures anywhere without his permission. Soon afterward he laid down his office and lived for the next fifteen years (1820–35) in strict retirement, devoting himself in the main to the guidance of an organization of Sisters of Charity. Even his consecration as suffragan bishop of Münster in 1827 did not allure him from the manner of life which had grown dear to him. But he forsook it later under remarkable circumstances; he was elected archbishop of Cologne Dec. 1, 1835, and enthroned May 29, 1836. What this promotion signified and what later brought about his fall can be understood only by knowing the situation in church politics when he took office, especially as regards the treatment of mixed marriages.

In 1741 Benedict XIV had waived the requirement that the Tridentine form for solemnizing matrimony be absolutely necessary (cf. Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 311–315). The Prussian General Law of 1794 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 329–330) had ordered that, when the parents belonged to different confessions, until the completion of the fourteenth year sons should be brought up in the religion of the father and daughters in the confession of the mother. This paragraph was then suspended for the eastern provinces of the monarchy by a Royal Declaration of 1803 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 339), because dangerous dissensions had been produced in the families affected; and it was provided that legitimate children should always be instructed in the religion of the father, and that neither husband nor wife should have the right to bind his or her helpmate by agreement to any deviation from this rule. By a Royal Cabinet Order of 1825 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 350) this law was extended to the Rhine provinces and Westphalia. At the same time it was forbidden that clergymen should demand from engaged couples of mixed confession a promise about the religious training of their future children. These laws, which affected Protestants as well as Roman Catholics, were, however, evaded by Catholic clergymen who, to be sure, did not demand the aforesaid promise, but, if it was not voluntarily given, refused to perform the ceremony. The complaints which the government received caused it to enter upon negotiations with the archbishop of Cologne (Count Spiegel), and the bishops of Treves (Joseph von Hommer), Paderborn (Friedrich von Ledebur), and Münster (Caspar von Droste), who showed an obliging spirit but declared that they could take no steps without the permission of the pope. With the consent of the government they therefore applied to Rome. The result of the negotiations carried on there between the Prussian Ambassador Bunsen and Cardinal Capellari was a brief of Pius VIII. dated Mar. 25, 1830 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 350–353), in which the regulation of Benedict XIV was extended to the four bishoprics above mentioned, and mixed marriages which had not been performed in the presence of a Catholic priest were recognized as valid; but on the real point in controversy, i.e., the promise about the education of the children, no decision was reached. As this brief, moreover, ordered that Catholic women should be warned against entering upon mixed marriages, and that Catholic priests should be forbidden to give the ecclesiastical benediction to such marriages, the Prussian government was not satisfied with the result. It attempted further direct negotiations with the bishops, and an agreement was closed in Berlin on June 19, 1834, between Bunsen and Count Spiegel, in accordance with which the brief of Pius VIII. should be transmitted to all priests; at the same time there was contemplated a similar set of directions for the general vicariates, concerning the practical treatment of mixed marriages. This instruction (Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 355–356) provided that all which had not expressly been prohibited in the brief should be held to be permitted, that the promise to educate the children in the religion of the one or the other of the parents should not be insisted on in practise, and that a mixed marriage should be entered upon in the usual solemn form; that is, by benediction, whereas the mere *assistentia passiva* of the clergyman was limited to special and exceptional cases. This agreement, to which the other bishops consented, was weak in that it had been reached without any cooperation by the Curia, and it had, moreover, merely the value of a personal arrangement; that is, it would be called in question as soon as one of these bishops died. The case arose the very next year; Count Spiegel passed away Aug. 2, 1835.

2. Mixed Marriages.

It was in fulfilment of an express wish of the Prussian government that Droste-Vischering became Spiegel's successor. It was expected that his mature age, his piety, and his inclination toward charitable work would hold his hierarchal tendencies in equilibrium, and it was hoped to produce

a favorable sentiment among the Catholic nobility by the appointment of one of its members. Before the election Droste-Vischering was confidentially asked whether as bishop he would maintain the agreement of June, 1834, and would be willing to apply this in a conciliatory way; and not until he expressly assured the government of this in a letter (Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 356) did the cathedral chapter receive the communication that the king desired his election. At first he held to the agreement; but in a few months his views underwent a complete transformation. The news of the government's arrangement with Spiegel had penetrated to Rome in spite of all secrecy and had caused the Curia to make energetic protests, which the Prussian ambassador unsuccessfully sought to refute by means of a denial of the agreement, more bold than skilful. Moreover, at that very time Ultramontanism began to enter the Rhine provinces by way of Belgium and at once employed its skill in arousing dissatisfaction. Droste-Vischering now all at once began to maintain that he had not known of the agreement of 1834 when he made his promise, and that he had given his consent because the minister assured him that it was in harmony with the brief of Pius VIII. The increasing complaints about the procedure of the archbishop at last compelled the minister, Von Altenstein (q.v.), to interfere. The president of the administration at Düsseldorf, Count Stolberg, appeared in Cologne in company with Bunsen, to treat personally with Droste-Vischering; but the conferences led to no understanding; the archbishop refused absolutely to acknowledge the arrangement of 1834 and declared that he wished to follow it only in so far as it was in accord with the brief.

3. Archbishop of Cologne.

There now arose a second contest with the government over its procedure against the supporters of Georg Hermes (q.v.). When Droste-Vischering entered upon his office the works of this theologian had already been condemned by Gregory XVI. (Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 357–358). Although the brief in question had not been laid before the Prussian government and therefore had not received the royal *placet*, the government nevertheless respected the verdict of the pope, and endeavored to forestall possible difficulties by having the professors of the Roman Catholic faculties notified that it expected that they would avoid everything which might be contrary to the pope's decision. That did not satisfy the archbishop, however, and, since the theological faculty of Bonn was the chief supporter of this tendency, he took measures against this educational institution. He began by exercising against the publications of its professors a criticism and censorship which was beyond his competence. He, moreover, sent a circular to the priests of the city of Bonn who heard confession, ordering them to use their influence so that no one should read the writings of Hermes and that no student should attend lectures disseminating such ideas. He allowed himself to use expressions which threw suspicion on the professors of theology at Bonn, and he cast doubt upon their orthodoxy. When they offered to prove their soundness he rejected their proposals and he refused to substantiate his charges, but did not withdraw them. The dormitory (*Konvikt*), which was partly supported by the city, suffered so much from the archbishop's interference that sixty of the seventy inmates left the house; he himself caused the priests' seminary in Cologne to be closed. Finally he went so far as to lay eighteen propositions before the newly consecrated priests for signature, containing among other things the promise to appeal from the decisions of the archbishop to nobody except to the pope. This was a direct attack on the right of the State to take cognizance of appeals concerning the misuse of ecclesiastical power. The above mentioned mission of Count Stolberg was intended to change the mind of the archbishop on this subject also, and an understanding was actually reached in this controversy; but it was not of practical significance, since the negotiations about the more important matter of mixed marriages were a failure.

4. The University of Bonn.

The government recognized the necessity of decisive action. On receipt of the news that the archbishop was exciting the population of Cologne, there was held in Berlin a council of ministers under the presidency of the king, and on Nov. 20, 1837, Archbishop Droste-Vischering was arrested and taken to the fortification of Minden. The impression of this event was extraordinary. On Dec. 10 Gregory XVI. pronounced a fulminant allocution in the presence of the cardinals, in which he took the side of the deposed archbishop without waiting for reports from Berlin, and declared that the freedom of the Church was violated, the episcopal dignity derided, the rights of the Church trodden under foot. Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador at the Curia, had to be recalled. The Prussian government tried to justify its procedure in the eyes of the public by means of a memorial, and when an answer to this was published in Rome it endeavored to refute it by a second account of the condition of things. The government was also supported by the cathedral chapter of Cologne in so far forth that the latter declared itself ready to continue to conduct affairs; and it succeeded in keeping in check the nobility and clergy who took delight in being in the opposition; at the same time it showed a personal courtesy to the archbishop by permitting him to retire to his ancestral castle of Darfeld. But it was not successful in quieting the excited Catholic population. Whether it would have had the power to maintain the position which it had taken is hard to say; but, as a matter of fact, after King Frederick William IV. succeeded Frederick William III. in 1840 the government at once changed its course and began a retreat which must be designated as the utter defeat of the State. Although Droste-Vischering was not allowed to return to Cologne, Bishop Von Geissel from Speyer undertaking to administer the archdiocese as coadjutor with the right of succession, he neverthe-

5. Droste-Vischering's Downfall.

less received from the king in reparation of his honor the declaration that the king had never entertained the thought that he had taken a part in machinations of political and revolutionary character. Moreover, the requirements previously made about mixed marriages were allowed to drop, the *placet* was waived, and in 1841 there was founded in the Prussian *Kultusministerium* a special Roman Catholic department which lasted down to 1871. Droste-Vischering spent the rest of his days in Münster far from public life. In no respect was he an important man, but he possessed great energy and perseverance. Since he aided his Church in winning a great triumph he was praised by Görres as an Athanasius, but his blustering manner reminds one rather of Epiphanius.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the life consult: J. von Görres, *Athanasius*, Regensburg, 1837 (a Catholic eulogy; cf. J. G. Schlemmer, *Görres in seinem Athanasius als Vertheidiger des Erzbischofs von Droste zu Vischering*, Nuremberg, 1838); C. A. Hase, *Die beiden Erzbischöfe*, Leipsic, 1839; P. C. Marheineke, *Der Erzbischof C. A. von Droste zu Vischering als Friedenstifter*, Berlin, 1843; F. A. Muth, in *Deutschlands Episcopat in Lebensbildern*, Würzburh, 1873. On the Cologne controversy, of fundamental importance for the relations of the Prussian state to the Catholic Church, consult: G. F. H. Rheinwald, *Allgemeines Repertorium für die theologische Literatur*, vols. xxii.–xxxvii., 1838–42 (lists of contemporary literature); C. C. J. von Bunsen, *Aus seinen Briefen*, Leipsic, 1868, Eng. transl., London, 1869; E. Friedberg, *Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche*, Tübingen, 1872; idem, *Grundlagen der preussischen Kirchenpolitik unter Friedrich Wilhelm IV.*, Leipsic, 1882; H. Schmid, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands*, Munich, 1874; H. von Sybel, *Klericale Politik im 19. Jahrhundert*, Bonn, 1874; C. Mirbt, *Die preussische Gesandtschaft am Hofe des Papstes*, Leipsic, 1899; H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. ii., Münster, 1903.

DROZ, drō, **FRANÇOIS XAVIER JOSEPH**: French moralist and historian; b. at Besançon Oct. 31, 1773; d. at Paris Nov. 5, 1850. In 1792 he went to Paris to study law, but on the declaration of war joined the volunteer battalion of Doubs, and served in the army of the Rhine for the next three years. Obliged by ill health to abandon his military career, he obtained the chair of eloquence in the École Centrale in his native town. In 1803 he removed to Paris, where for a time he held a position in the pension office; but after 1814 he devoted himself exclusively to his favorite pursuit of literature. In 1824 he became a member of the French Academy, and in 1838 president of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. At first an epicurean and a sensualist, he became more religious as he grew older. His last work was *Pensées sur le Christianisme* (Paris, 1844), to which he added *Aveux d'un philosophe Chrétien* in 1848. Other works were: *De la philosophie morale* (Paris, 1823); *Œuvres morales* (2 vols., 1826); and *Histoire du règne de Louis XVI.* (3 vols., 1839–42).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. P. Damiron, *Essai sur l'histoire de la philosophie en France au dix-neuvième siècle*, ii. 79 sqq., Paris, 1834; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 104–105.

DRUID: A member of an order in Celtic Gaul and Britain, or of a class in Ireland, which in pre-Roman and pre-Christian times had charge of religious rites. The subject is most obscure. The early disappearance of the druids in Gaul and Britain before the advance of Roman civilization, and in Ireland before Christianity, so obliterated traces of them that all information is ultimately derived from the classical writers and from early Irish hagiological works. The name has been falsely connected with the Greek *drys*, "an oak," to which the worship in the oak groves gave factitious verisimilitude; it is really derived from a Celtic root which bears the idea of magical dealing. The sources of information are on the classical side: Cæsar, *De bello Gallico*, vi. 13–20; Tacitus, *Annales*, xiv. 30, and *Historia*, iv. 54; Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, xxx. 4, 13, xxxi. 1; Cicero, *De divinatione*; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Hist.*, XV. ix. 8, and scattered notices in Suetonius (*Claudius*, xxv.), Diogenes Laertius, and Diodorus Siculus; from the Irish side the *Tripartite Life* of Patrick, Adamnan's life of Columba, and a large number of scattered notices mainly, legendary.

Name and Sources of Knowledge.

Cæsar's account, which is much the fullest of all which can claim historical value, states that above the mass of the people in Gaul (who were slaves) were two classes, the nobles and the druids. The latter officiated at public and private sacrifices, expounded religious duties and observances, trained the youth, decided public questions concerning succession, inheritance, crimes, boundaries, and the like. To their decisions submission was required under penalty of interdiction from participation in sacred rites, the severest punishment conceivable to the people. A yearly meeting of chief druids was held, at which an archdruid was selected by vote. The members of the order were exempt from taxation and from military duty. Because of this they had many students, some of whom remained with them for twenty years, during which they learned a "great number of verses," which were transmitted orally, since sacred things were not committed to writing. They taught the transmigration of souls, the end of the world by fire and water, discussed natural science, astronomy, and the nature of the gods. They officiated at human and other sacrifices and at all religious rites. The human sacrifices were offered sometimes in holocausts, the victims being prisoners of war, criminals, or even voluntary sufferers, and they were burned after being enclosed in huge wicker images. Cæsar equates the chief deity with Mercury as the god of culture, and other deities with Apollo, Mars, Jupiter, and Minerva. He guesses at a British origin for the institution.

Cæsar's Account.

Pliny, assigning a Gallic origin, tells of the ceremony of the cutting of the mistletoe (associated by the druids with immortality) and narrates a curious story of the "serpents' egg," an accretion formed by a mass of writhing serpents and cast out of their midst, and then caught by a druid before it touched the ground and used for magical purposes. Tacitus asserts that they deduced auguries from human entrails, and that the groves, particularly of the Isle of Anglesey, were the sites of bloody sacrifices. Ammianus Marcellinus makes three classes

Other Classical and Irish Accounts.

of literati among the Gauls, bards, *eubages* (students of nature), and druids—an order like the Pythagoreans. Suetonius asserts that Claudius extinguished the religion in Gaul, and Pliny that Tiberius suppressed the order. Diogenes Laertius (preface to the *Philosophoi bioi*) makes the druids the originators of philosophy among the Celts, and ascribes to them as the sum of their teaching the triple maxim, "Honor the gods, do no evil, be brave." The Irish hagiology ascribes to the druids great influence, makes their decision precede even that of kings, and, in its later forms, makes them appear as powerful magicians whom Patrick could vanquish only with difficulty, as soothsayers, diviners, protectors of sacred springs, as imposers of sacred duties and taboos, and as cherishing the oak, yew, blackthorn, and mountain ash, with the ivy as a magical herb. The druids appear to have had a tonsure in Ireland which Christians adopted, the form of which was different from the Roman by which it was superseded. The Irish druids were not organized, but were a learned class.

Present Knowledge.

The impression left by these early accounts is that the Gallic and British druids were an order wielding political power, since they influenced the choice of magistrates; social power, since they decided civil and criminal causes; and religious power, since they controlled sacred rites. They were rich, masterful, and despotic. The reports of human sacrifices are circumstantial and supported by the detail of the means of obtaining auguries. A connection with Greek learning is suggested by Cæsar's mention of the use of Greek characters for record of matters not religious, though no archeological evidence in support of this is known. That a part of their knowledge was esoteric is supported by the fact that they were not a numerous class as compared with the number of their pupils. The difference between the druidism of Britain and that of Ireland argues no close, or at least no continuous connection between the two. The popular association of the druids with dolmens, menhirs, and cromlechs has at its basis only that the druids used these places, with no probability that they erected the monuments.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. R. Green, *History of the English People*, vol. i., London, 1892; D. W. Nash, *Taliesin, or the Bards and Druids of Britain*, chap. iii., London, 1858; J. Rhys, *Celtic Heathendom*, ib. 1888; idem, *Celtic Britain*, pp. 70–73, ib. 1904; T. Olden, *Church of Ireland*, chap. i., ib. 1892; J. von Pflug-Harttung, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1893, pp. 55–75; Adamnan, *Vita S. Columbæ*, pp. xviii.–xxiii. et passim, Oxford, 1894; J. V. Montbarlet, *Les Pierres et l'histoire. Le Druidisme*, Paris, 1896; A. Bertrand, *La Religion des Gaulois; les Druides et le Druidisme*, pp. 268 sqq., ib. 1897; G. Dottin, *La Bretagne et les pays celtiques*, iv. 268–295, ib. 1906; P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Religions-Geschichte*, ii. 572–574, Tübingen, 1905; C. Reuel, *Les Religions de la Gaule avant le Christianisme*, Paris, 1907.

DRUMMOND, HENRY: **1.** Apostle of the Catholic Apostolic Church; b. at the Grange, Hampshire (s.w. of London), 1786; d. at Albury (25 m. s.w. of London), Surrey, Feb. 20, 1860. He was educated at Harrow, and studied two years in Christ Church, Oxford, but did not take a degree. From 1810 to 1813 he was in Parliament, but failing health compelled him to retire. In 1817 he met Robert Haldane (q.v.) in Geneva and was led by him to support the evangelical Genevan clergy against the Socinian majority, and in 1819 to found the Continental Society, of which he was the mainstay for many years. In 1826 he gathered in his house at Albury a number of clergymen and laymen for a conference upon the prophetic Scriptures. These conferences were continued annually for five years. Out of them came the organization of the Catholic Apostolic Church (q.v.), to the apostolate of which Drummond was called in 1832. The apostles' chapel and chapter-house at Albury were erected by him. From 1847 till his death he was member of Parliament from West Surrey; he was, generally speaking, a Tory of the old school, but was remarkable for the independence of his political position, while at the same time he always supported the budget, as a matter of principle, whatever party might be in power. His son-in-law Lord Lovaine after his death brought out a collection of his *Speeches in Parliament and Some Miscellaneous Pamphlets* (2 vols., London, 1860); his lectures in the churches have also been published, and *Abstract Principles of Revealed Religion* (London, 1845).

SAMUEL J. ANDREWS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A memoir is contained in Lord Lovaine's ed. of his *Speeches*, ut sup.; Margaret Oliphant, *Life of Edward Irving*, London, 1865; *DNB*, xvi. 28–29.

2. Free Church of Scotland; b. at Stirling Aug. 17, 1851; d. at Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Mar. 11, 1897. He studied at Edinburgh University, but left before receiving a degree. In 1870 he began the divinity course of the Free Church at New College, Edinburgh, and also attended the University of Tübingen for a semester in 1873. In 1874–75 he took an active part in the revival work of Moody and Sankey, but in 1875 returned to New College, and two years later was appointed lecturer in natural science at the Free Church College, Glasgow. He was appointed full professor of theology in 1884, and seven months later was ordained to the ministry of the Free Church. He made a visit to the United States in 1879, and in 1882 again assisted Moody in Great Britain. In 1883 he went to Africa for a scientific exploration of Lakes Nyasa and Tanganyika for the African Lakes Corporation, returning to Scotland in 1884. He visited the American colleges in 1887, and the Australian in 1890, in the interest of student missions, and in 1893 delivered the Lowell lectures in Boston. Being himself a highly educated man and a winning personality and fired by missionary zeal, he had a great influence upon educated people, and especially upon students. He was a true Students' Apostle, and won many of them to a religious life. His writings had an enormous sale. Of them may be mentioned: *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* (London, 1883); *Tropical Africa* (1888); *The Greatest Thing in the World and other Addresses* (1894); *The Ascent of Man* (Lowell Lectures; 1894); *The Ideal Life and other unpublished Addresses* (1897); and *The New Evangelism and other Papers* (1899).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. A. Smith, *Life of Henry Drummond*, London, 1899; H. M. Cecil, *Pseudo-Philosophy at the End*

of the Nineteenth Century, vol. i., ib. 1897; R. A. Watson, *Gospels of Yesterday*, ib. 1898; T. Hunter Boyd, *Henry Drummond; Some Recollections*, ib. 1907.

DRUMMOND, JAMES: Unitarian; b. at Dublin May 14, 1835. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1855), and Manchester New College, London (1856–59), and after being assistant minister with William Gaskell at Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, 1859–69, was appointed professor of New Testament divinity in Manchester New College, which was removed to Oxford in 1889 and called Manchester College in 1893. From 1885 to 1906 he was also principal of the college, but retired from both positions in 1906. He describes himself as a "liberal Christian." He has written *Spiritual Religion* (sermons; London, 1870); *The Jewish Messiah* (1877); *Introduction to the Study of Theology* (1884); *Philo Judæus, or the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion* (2 vols., 1888); *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians Explained and Illustrated* (1893); *Via, Veritas, Vita* (Hibbert Lectures for 1894; 1894); *The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, and Philippians* (1899); *Life and Letters of James Martineau* (in collaboration with C. B. Upton; 1902); and *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (1904).

DRURY, AUGUSTUS WALDO: United Brethren; b. at Pendleton, Ind., Mar. 2, 1851. He studied at Western College (now Leander Clark College), Toledo, Ia. (B.A., 1872), Union Biblical Seminary, Dayton, O., from which he was graduated in 1877, and the University of Berlin (1886). After being professor of classics in Western College 1872–1873 and holding various pastorates in his denomination 1873-80, he was professor of church history in Union Biblical Seminary 1880–92. Since 1892 he has been professor of systematic theology in the same institution. He has been secretary of the United Brethren Historical Society since 1885, and was a member of the Tri-church Council (Congregational, United Brethren, and Methodist Protestant) in 1906–07. In 1891–92 he was editor of *The United Brethren Quarterly Review*, and has written *The Life of Philip William Otterbein* (Dayton, 1884); *The Life of Bishop J. J. Glossbrenner* (1889); *Disciplines of the United Brethren in Christ* (1895); *Minutes of Annual and General Conferences* (1897); and *Baptism* (1902).

DRURY, JOHN BENJAMIN: Reformed (Dutch); b. at Rhinebeck, N. Y., Aug. 15, 1838; d. at New Brunswick, N. J., Mar. 21, 1909. He studied at Rutgers College (B.A., 1858), and the New Brunswick Theological Seminary (1861), supplied the Reformed Church at Davenport, Ia., 1861–62, was pastor of the First Reformed Church at Ghent, N. Y., 1864–87. After 1887 he was editor of the *Christian Intelligencer*. He was president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America in 1886. In 1883 he was Vedder lecturer in Rutgers College and New Brunswick Theological Seminary. In theology he was a liberal Calvinist. He wrote *Historical Sketch of the First Reformed Church of Ghent* (Chatham, N. Y., 1876); *Historical Sketch of the Reformed (Dutch) Church of Rhinebeck, N. Y* (1881); and *Truths and Untruths of Evolution* (Vedder Lectures; New York, 1884).

DRURY, MARION RICHARDSON: United Brethren; b. at Pendleton, Ind., Dec. 27, 1849. He studied at Western College (now Leander Clark College), Toledo, Ia. (B.A., 1872), and was graduated from Union Biblical Seminary, Dayton, O., in 1875. He held pastorates at Toledo, Ia. (1875–87), and Cedar Rapids, Ia. (1878–81), and from 1881 to 1897 was associate editor of the *Religious Telescope* (Dayton, O.). Since 1898 he has been pastor of the First United Brethren Church, Toledo, Ia. In theology he is an orthodox member of his denomination. He has written *Pastor's Pocket Record* (Dayton, O., 1883); *The Otterbein Birthday Book* (1887); *Handbook for Workers* (1888); *Pastor's Companion* (1894); *At Hand* (1895); *Our Catechism* (1897); and *Life and Career of Bishop James W Hott, D.D.* (1902).

DRUSES.

Origin (§ 1).
Mohammedan Forerunners of the Druses (§ 2).
Obscurity of the Druse Religion (§ 3).
Doctrine of God (§ 4).
The "Administrators" (§ 5).
Nature of the Soul (§ 6).
Knowledge (§ 7).
Ethics and Customs (§ 8)

Druses are the adherents of a composite sect which still exists in Syria, especially in the Lebanon. From their use of the Arabic language the Druses, who term themselves "Confessors of the Unity (of God)," seem to be a mixture of Syrians and Arabs. Their type, on the other hand, would indicate that they are descendants of the pre-Mohammedan Aramaic population. The steady resistance of this liberty-loving community to the State has aided in the preservation of their religion through the centuries, while they feel, on the other hand, that they form a distinct nation simply because of their religious isolation. By their tenacity, cunning, and valor they have succeeded in resisting all attempts at subjugation, and still form a State within a State. They now number about 100,000, although in recent years political circumstances have led many families to emigrate from Lebanon to the Hauran, where they have settled among the peasants and Bedouins of that region. It is worth noting that there are two Druse villages on Mt. Carmel, and they have a sanctuary there at which they perform a yearly sacrifice.

1. Origin.

The origin of the religion is closely connected with the Egyptian Fatimite calif al-Hakim bi'amri-llah (996–1021). His chief object was the propagation of the tenets of the sect of the Ismailiyyah, the main source of the doctrines of the Druses, in Egypt, where the people were adherents of orthodox Sunnite Mohammedanism. In 1017 a Turk named Darazi, a member of the Ismailiyyah, who had come from the East and had been made a confidant of al-Hakim, published a work asserting that the soul of Adam had passed to Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of Mohammed, whence it had descended to the Fatimites, and thus had come to al-Hakim. The heretic barely escaped with his life from the fury of the people, but the calif aided him to flee to Syria, where at Wadi al-Taim, in the southern Lebanon,

he founded the sect which received its name from him, *duruz* being the plural of *darazi*. Three years later the Persian sectary Hamzah again sought to propagate kindred doctrines in Egypt, but was forced to take refuge in flight with Darazi, whose theological authority he became. A few years later the calif al-Hakim mysteriously disappeared, and the Druses believe that he is concealed somewhere as the incarnation of the divinity and will appear at the end of time as theMahdi.

In origin the Druses were both political and religious, since they were closely connected with the Shiites, the strict legitimists who upheld the claims of Ali and the first three califs, but rejected the Ommiads and the Abbassids. These Shiites, especially in Persia, regarded Ali and his descendants, the Imams, as incarnations of the Deity, and held that the soul of an Imam passed immediately at his death into the body of his successor. Since it was politically dangerous to appear as an Imam, the theory of a hidden Imam was developed, of whom the Mahdi is to be the last. The missionary activity of the various Shiite sects included northern Africa, and was accepted by the Fatimite califs.

2. Mohammedan Forerunners of the Druses.

Of these sects the Ismailiyyah and the Karmathians were the most important for the development of the Druses. The Ismailiyyah rose about 765. After the death of the Imam Jaafar a schism was caused by the fact that some accepted his son Musa as the seventh Imam, while others gave this honor to his other son, Ismail. The same period saw a development of the theory that incarnations of the divinity had been sent to earth to bring man nearer to God and to reveal his will. These prophets, who were called "speakers" (*naṭik*), were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, and Mohammed al-Mahdi, the son of Ismail. These prophets, each of whom marked an advance on the teachings of his predecessors, were aided by a "silent one," who spoke nothing on his own authority, but proclaimed and promulgated the tenets of the "speakers." These "silent ones" are the Imams, so that Seth was the Imam to the prophet Adam, Shem to Noah, Ishmael to Abraham, Aaron to Moses, Peter to Jesus, Ali to Mohammed, and Abdallah ibn Maimun to Mohammed al-Mahdi, and between each prophet came seven Imams. This entire system of prophets and Imams was accepted, though with modifications, by the Druses. The Abdallah ibn Maimun just mentioned was an adherent of a dualistic sect and used his propaganda of the doctrines of the Ismailiyyah solely to advance his teachings which were a confused mixture of Zoroastrian, Manichean, and Greek concepts. His missionaries were charged to lead suitable adepts of the new faith through various stages (at first seven, and later nine) to his own nihilistic and materialistic point of view, thus alienating them not only from Shiite Mohammedanism, but from all positive religion. Abdallah's propaganda naturally brought upon him the hostility of the authorities, and he was forced to flee to the town of Salamiyyah in Syria. Many adherents were won in Persia and the lands lying along the Euphrates, while on the lower Euphrates the Karmathians split off from the Ismailiyyah and formed a political party with communistic tenets. The Ismailiyyah also made their way back to Africa before the califate of al-Hakim bi'amri-llah, as noted above, and communities of them still exist in Syria.

The doctrines of the Druses mark an advance over the tenets of the Ismailiyyah and the Karmathians, their immediate predecessors, and they regard the teachings of the Ismailiyyah, like Shiitism and Islam in general, as superseded by their own and even hostile to them. On the other hand, the Mohammedans consider the Druses infidels, and Islamic writings seldom mention them. The difficulty of a clear presentment of the confused doctrines of the Druses is increased by the fact that their religion is esoteric, its adherents being forbidden to reveal its mysteries to non-believers and being required to hide their religious books from all. Druses who have been initiated into the faith seldom become converts to other religions, and from the uneducated nothing can be learned. Many dogmas and customs, moreover, which formerly had a distinct religious meaning, now survive as unintelligible remnants, especially as the Druses seldom pursue deep religious studies, and the very fact that the religion is secret (as it must be on account of the Mohammedan attitude toward it) renders it peculiarly liable to the danger of degenerating into meaningless phrases and ceremonies. The many-sided character of their religion makes it possible for Druses to emphasize the Islamic elements of their faith in conversing with Mohammedans and to follow a similar course with Christians or even with freemasons.

3. Obscurity of the Druse Religion.

According to the teaching of the Druses, God is one, and the confession of his unity is the first duty of religion. While this coincides with the Koran, their doctrine that God is devoid of all attributes, having neither origin, limitations, definitions, names, or anthropomorphism of any sort, makes them closely akin to the rationalistic Mutazilah. This philosophical concept of God might seem to lead to pantheism, but its principal result was the theory that the Deity, in order to approach more closely to man, has revealed himself in bodily form, and has accordingly hidden himself in men; although man does not thereby become the Divinity. God ever remains the same, even in these forms which serve him as a veil, and it is, therefore, the duty of each one to attain through these manifestations a knowledge of God and a proof of his existence. The last of the ten (or nine) incarnations of the Divinity was the calif al-Hakim.

4. Doctrine of God.

The real administrators of the world and the actual preachers or priests for mankind, however, are the "bonds" (*ḥudud*), or "revelations" (*ayyat*), which are also called by many other names. The chief terms are derived from the fact that before the origin of the Druses the Mohammedan sect of the Bataniyyah interpreted every expression of the Koran allegorically and applied it to persons. In the system of the Druses such administrators were primarily abstract ideas which were later regarded as incarnate. The persons in whom they dwelt,

who have lived at various times under various names, are regarded, however, merely as bearers of the one unchanged idea. The first of these administrators was Will, a figure of perfect purity created by God from the light which streams from him, and from it all else comes. It is also universal Wisdom, from which all truths are an emanation. Although it is a "speaker," it has appeared at various times as an Imam, its last incarnation being Hamzah, who had attended Adam as Shatniel, Noah as Pythagoras, Abraham as David, and who was Eleazar, the true Messiah, in the days of Jesus. When, however, Wisdom saw that he had no equal, he became proud, and thus was born Darkness, the author of disobedience in every form. Wisdom then implored forgiveness, and at his prayer God created as the second administrator the universal Soul, who received the knowledge of truth from Wisdom, to whom she stands in the relation of a wife, the other administrators deriving their existence from her. The soul has likewise been incarnate at certain times, as in Enoch and Hermes, while Hamzah regarded his contemporary Abu Ibrahim Ismail ibn Muhammad as an incorporation of this principle. The union of Wisdom and Soul produced the Word (in the Neoplatonic sense), while Soul's need of assistance against the adversary resulted in the fourth administrator, the "Preceding," or "Left Wing." On this principle the writings of the Druses are vague and scanty, although it is apparently derived from the allegorism of the Bataniyyah. The fifth and last administrator, called the "Following," or the "Right Wing," is important as being identified with the last noteworthy author of the sect, Abu'l-Hassan Ali, surnamed al-Muktanah or Baha al-Din, who established the doctrines of the Druses on a dogmatic basis about 1038.

5. The "Administrators."

A subordinate hierarchy must be distinguished from the one just described. On the "Following" are dependent the spiritual leaders of the Druses, who are called, in decreasing order, *Da'i* ("missionary"), *Ma'dhun* ("he to whom it is permitted"), and *Mukassir* ("breaker," i.e., of the doctrines of other beliefs). These subordinate hierarchs are invariably regarded as men. The five celestial administrators are opposed, furthermore, by five principles of error, who have been incarnate in Mohammed, Ali, and others.

Both the universe and man were created in their present form, so that they are as immutable as God himself. Man is composed of two essentials, wisdom and soul, and of one accident, body. The souls have been created from eternity, but are later than universal Wisdom. The number of souls, like that of men, remains invariable; when a man dies his soul enters another body, generally without remembrance of the past, the souls of unbelievers again becoming infidels and the souls of the faithful remaining believers. They do not, however, enter the bodies of animals, but are reincarnated in better or worse human forms according to their deeds in their former life. The number of Druses, therefore, neither increases nor diminishes, but they also believe that in the farthest parts of China coreligionists live, where the soul of a dead Druse may find its reincarnation. Souls pass through a certain process of purification until the end of time, when al-Hakim and Hamzah will again appear and when the souls will commingle in the Imam.

6. Nature of the Soul.

True knowledge consists in insight into the nature and dogmas of unitarianism, the cardinal feature of the religion of the Druses. It is divided into five parts, two concerned with nature, especially with the healing of men and animals, and two with religion. The first of the latter is understanding of external religion, or revelation, and was the function of the "speakers," Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed. The second religious truth is that each of these "speakers" had an *asas* ("foundation," a synonym for the "silent ones"), who represented the interpretation of revelation. These "speakers" all typified true religion or the unitarianism of the Druses, which is also taught in the Pentateuch, in the Psalms, in the Gospel, and in the Koran, although these books are a mixture of truth and falsehood and have been superseded by the teaching of the Druses. In their knowledge of religion the Druses are divided into "initiates" (*'ukḳal*) and "ignorant" (*juhhal*), the former having a much higher rank, and the latter being denoted by distinctive clothing. There are also apparently many intermediate grades. The places of worship of the Druses are situated in lonely spots outside the villages. The initiates gather there frequently, but the nature of worship in these *khalwas* is unknown. They are often said to reverence a calf, which, if true, may represent a principle of evil.

7. Knowledge.

In conformity with their doctrine of the immutability of bodies and spirits, the Druses make no religious propaganda whatever. When al-Hakim returns, however, he will either destroy or subjugate the misbelievers, and will found an earthly kingdom in which his followers will rule in wealth. The time of the coming of this Messianic kingdom is unknown, although signs will herald its approach, one portent being a period when the Druses are in a most pitiable plight and the Christians have gained power over the Mohammedans.

The ethics of the Druses are closely connected with the practise of their faith, but the Mohammedan prescriptions of prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, and the like, already allegorized away by the Bataniyyah, are altogether discarded. According to De Sacy, the seven religious duties of the Druses are as follows: to speak the truth; to watch over their mutual safety; to follow the religion which they have professed, and to renounce the faith and worship of vanity and falsehood; to separate themselves from evil spirits and men of false creed; to confess the unity of God, as it has existed throughout the centuries; to be content with the acts of God, whatever they may be; and to submit entirely to the divine guidance in weal and wo. They are also enjoined to abstain from unlawful gain, to be dignified, and to refrain from cursing.

8. Ethics and Customs.

The use of wine and tobacco is forbidden, at least to the initiates, while grave misdemeanors are punished severely, and even with exclusion from the community. Women are more highly esteemed among them than by the modern Mohammedans, and are usually instructed in reading and religion, although, in conformity with ancient Oriental usage, they are veiled in the presence of strangers.

It is impossible, with the sources thus far known, to give a complete presentment of the religion of the Druses, nor do they themselves possess a perfect system of all their dogmas, for in the course of centuries many new doctrines have been developed, and others have been forgotten. Although their faith is not without its dark aspects, the Druses have sought with all their might to preserve their views and customs, and to defend against external influences their consciousness of nationality, which rests upon a foundation of religion.

(A. Socin†.)

Bibliography: S. de Sacy, *Exposé de la religion des Druzes*, 2 vols., Paris, 1838; C. Niebuhr, *Reisebeschreibung*, ii. 428 sqq., Copenhagen, 1778; C. H. Churchill, *Ten Years' Residence in Lebanon, Full Account of the Druze Religion*, 4 vols. (vol. iv. is *Druzes and Maronites under Turkish Rule*), London, 1853–62; G. W. Chasseaud, *Visits to the Druzes of Lebanon*, ib. 1854; Earl of Carnarvon, *Recollections of the Druzes of Lebanon*, ib. 1860; B. H. Cowper, *Sects in Syria*, ib. 1860; H. Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, i. 375 sqq., Leipsic, 1860; H. Guys, *Théogonie des Druses*, Paris, 1863; idem, *La Nation Druse, son histoire, sa religion, ses mœurs*, Marseilles, 1864; R. Dozy, *Het Islamism*, Haarlem, 1880; L. Oliphant, *Land of Gilead*, London, 1880; idem, *Haifa, or Life in Modern Palestine*, ib. 1887; A. Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland*, i. 629 sqq., Berlin, 1885; T. Waldemeier, *Autobiography: . Sixteen Years in Syria*, London, 1886; W. Ewing, *Arab and Druze at Home*, ib. 1907.

DRUSILLA. See Herod and his Family.

DRUSIUS, JOHANNES (Jan van den Driessche): Orientalist and exegete; b. at Audenarde (Oudenaarde; 14 m. s.s.w. of Ghent), in East Flanders, June 28, 1550; d. in Franeker Feb. 12, 1616. He studied Latin and Greek under Peter Dickel at Ghent, and with Cornelius Valerius and Johannes Stadius at Louvain. When his father, Clement van den Driessche, was proscribed in 1567 as a zealous Protestant and had to flee, the son followed him to London where, among others, his teacher was Antoine Rudolphe le Chevalier. In 1572 Drusius became professor of Oriental languages at Oxford. After the Peace of Ghent (1576) had enabled him to return home, he filled the like office at Leyden. In 1585 he accepted a call to Franeker, where he lived as professor of the Hebrew language until his death. His scholarship was recognized wherever unprejudiced judgment was not overcast by theological bias. When a committee was organized in 1596 for the preparation of a new Dutch version of the Bible, Drusius was made a member upon the recommendation of Arminius and Uytenbogaert; but subsequently the committee was obliged to dissolve. In 1600 Drusius was commissioned by the States General to annotate difficult passages of the Old Testament, to which task he devoted himself with great industry, but had often to hear reproaches of tardy progress. He was also attacked by theologians of other opinions for being a friend of Arminius and Uytenbogaert. Even the morality of his family was assailed. Taken all in all, the accusations brought against him by his pupil Sixtinus Amama and others have been shown to be unjust. But in his age of stormy conflicts he passed for an undecided man because, having applied himself with all his might to the advancement of Biblical science, in connection with his investigations he could not admit dogmatic definitions as authoritative. He repeatedly appeals to the "judgment of the Church catholic" against particular churches and ecclesiastical factions, by which he will not suffer himself to be restricted in his scholarly activity. Only a small portion of his notes on the Old Testament appeared in his lifetime; the rest were published by Amama and others, 1617–36. He also wrote comments on the New Testament, containing especially elucidations from the Talmud and rabbinical sources (Franeker, 1612; 2d ed., 1616). His collective works were issued by Amama (10 vols., Arnheim and Amsterdam, 1622–36). Lists of Drusius's numerous writings are to be found in Meursius, Vriemoet, and Nicéron. In the *Critica sacra* his annotations stand after those of Münster, Fagius, Vatablus, Castalio, and Clarius; they rank among the most important in this great compilation.

Carl Bertheau.

Bibliography: A. Curiander, *Vitæ operumque Johannis Drusii . delineatio et tituli*, Franeker, 1616; J. Meursius, *Athenæ Batavæ*, pp. 252 sqq., Leyden, 1625; R. Simon, *Histoire critique du V. T.*, p. 499, Paris, 1680; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, xxii. 57–76; G. W. Meyer, *Geschichte der Schrifterklärung*, iii. 413–414, Göttingen, 1804; F. A. Tholuck, *Das akademische Leben des 17. Jahrhunderts*, ii. 206, 378, Halle, 1854; L. Diestel, *Geschichte des A. T. in der christlichen Kirche*, passim, especially pp. 422 sqq., Jena, 1869; *ADB*, v. 439–440.

DRUTHMAR, CHRISTIAN: The name assigned to the author of an extensive commentary on Matthew, and two briefer ones on Luke and John. It has recently been shown, however, that the name Druthmar does not occur in the manuscripts, but is based on a statement of Trithemius (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, 280), and therefore must be given up. According to the prologue to the commentary on Matthew, Christian was a monk in the cloister of Stabulaus (the modern Stavelot, 24 m. s.e. of Liége), where he wrote his work on the basis of the lectures which he delivered in the school of the monastery. Sigibert of Gembloux (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, 72) states that Christian came from Aquitaine to Gaul, although certain passages in his own writings make plausible the conjecture that his native district was Burgundy. His date can only be conjectured, but his statement that the Bulgarians were in process of conversion to Christianity during his lifetime points approximately to 865. A deacon named Christian is known to have lived at Stavelot in 880, and it is not impossible that he was the exegete. The commentary on Matthew ranks above the average contribution of the ninth century. Though the author drew much from other sources, he did not content himself with mere excerpting, but proceeded with a considerable degree of independence. He was tolerably accurate in his judgment on literal and allegorical exegesis, preferring the former in cases of advantage, yet not disdaining

the latter. The other two commentaries are inferior in value, and may have been merely notes for his lectures. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *editio princeps* of the Commentary was published Strasburg, 1514; the Commentary on Matthew was published separately by M. Molther at Hagenau, 1530, and in *MPL*, cvi. Consult E. Dümmler, *Ueber Christian von Stavelot*, in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1891, p. 935.

DRYANDER, ERNST: German Protestant; b. at Halle Apr. 18, 1843. He studied in Halle and Tübingen (1860–64), and, after being assistant pastor at the Berlin Cathedral 1870–72, was pastor at Torgau 1872–74 and Bonn 1874–82, and superintendent and pastor of Trinity Church, Berlin, 1882–98. From 1890 to 1900 he was superintendent-general of the Kurmark, and has been chief court preacher since 1898. He was chosen a member of the Evangelical Church Council in 1900, and has been a member of the Prussian Upper House since 1901, and since 1905 canon of Brandenburg. He has written *Evangelische Predigten* (2 vols., Bonn, 1884–86); *Das Evangelium Marci in Predigten* (2 vols., Bremen, 1890–92); *Der erste Brief Johannis in Predigten* (1898; Eng. transl. by W. O. E. Oesterley, London, 1899); and *Das Leben des Apostels Paulus in Predigten* (Halle, 1904).

DRYSDALE, ALEXANDER HUTTON: United Free Presbyterian; b. at Bridge of Allan (32 m. n.w. of Edinburgh), Stirlingshire, Scotland, June 3, 1837. He studied at Edinburgh University (M.A., 1858) and the United Presbyterian Theological Hall, Edinburgh, and has been minister of Maisondieu Church, Brechin, Forfarshire (1861–67), Trinity Church, Rochdale, Lancashire (1867–83), and St. George's Church, Morpeth, Northumberlandshire (since 1883). He has been a member of the examining board of the Theological College of the Presbyterian Church of England (now Westminster College, Cambridge) since 1885, convener of his denomination since 1898, and was a member of the committee on law and historical documents in preparing the revised edition of the Book of Order in 1905. In theology he is emphatically evangelical, but has no fears of the results of criticism. He has written *Exposition of the Epistle to Philemon* (London, 1879; new ed., 1906); *History of the Presbyterians in England* (1889); *Early Bible Songs* (1890); and *A Moderator's Year* (sermons and addresses; 1904).

DUALISM: In general, any twofold classification that admits of no intermediate degrees; in philosophy, the theory that the facts of the world are to be explained by two independent and eternally coexistent principles, viz., mind and matter (see DESCARTES, RENE); in theology, the view that there are two mutually hostile forces in the world, one the creator of all things good, both in nature and morals, the other the source of all evil and sin.

It has been claimed that all heathen, or at least all polytheistic, religions are of a dualistic character; but this is true only to a limited extent. To be sure, in polytheistic religions there is always the belief in demons. These are the enemies of man, and appear as the personification of disease, death, and all natural phenomena harmful to man (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1, a, § 4). However, though they have a certain influence in the world of nature, they are never supposed to influence the moral order of the world, and so are not responsible for moral evil. Hence, such religions can not be called dualistic in the proper sense of the word. Throughout heathendom there is only one religion that can be said to be dualistic, and that is Zoroastrianism (q.v.). According to the teachings of Zoroaster, there are two personal creative forces in the world: (1) Ahura Mazda, the good spirit, the creator of gods and men and all that is beneficent in nature, and the guardian of the moral order of the world; (2) Angra Mainyu, the evil spirit, the creator of demons and all that is injurious in nature, and the source of all evil and sin. He is the enemy of Ahura Mazda and tries to overthrow the moral order by tempting men to sin, and thus making them his allies. This conflict between the two spirits continues till the end of the world; and this dualism extends through the whole of nature. Everything that exists belongs either to the creation of Ahura Mazda or to that of Angra Mainyu; and only man, by reason of a free will, can choose for himself one master rather than the other, though morally he belongs on the side of Ahura Mazda, his creator. It must be added that this dualism is not perfect in the sense that the two powers are equally matched. With his superior wisdom Ahura Mazda has the advantage from the beginning, and is to triumph over his enemy in the end. Then Angra Mainyu, with all that he created, shall be destroyed, and his followers, after they have been purified by a great world-fire, shall return to their creator. Thus the spirit of goodness reigns supreme in the end, and the dualism is overcome. See GNOSTICISM, § 6.

(B. LINDNER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature of specific forms of dualism will be found under CELIBACY, MANICHEANS, NEW MANICHEANS, ZOROASTRIANISM. For further treatment consult the works on the hist. of philosophy by F. Ueberweg, New York, 1894, J. E. Erdmann, London, 1893, and W. Windelband, ib. 1893. Also *KL*, iii. 2092–96.

DU BARTAS, dü bär"tä', GUILLAUME DE SALLUSTE, SEIGNEUR: French Protestant; b. at Montfort, near Auch (42 m. w. of Toulouse), 1544; d. in Paris July, 1590. He served in the Huguenot army under Henry of Navarre and undertook diplomatic missions to Denmark, Scotland, and England. His death was caused by a wound received at the battle of Ivry. As a poet he enjoyed great popularity in the sixteenth century, being regarded by the Protestants as the superior of the famous Ronsard. His poetry has been praised by no less a critic than Goethe. His masterpiece, *La Semaine ou la création du monde*, was published in 1578. In six years it passed through thirty editions and was translated into almost every European language (Eng. transl. by J. Sylvester, in *Du Bartas, his Divine Weekes and Workes*, London, 1641). In 1584 he published *La Seconde semaine*, an epic embodying a large part of the history of the Old Testament. The first collected edition of his works appeared in 1611 (2 vols.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau . . de la poésie française au XVIe siècle*, 2 vols., Paris, 1838; P.

Sayous, *Études sur les écrivains de la Réformation*, ib. 1841; E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. H. L. Bordier, Paris, 1877–86; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 112–114, Paris, 1878; H. M. Baird, *Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, i. 175, New York, 1886.

DUBBINK, GERRIT HENDRIK: Reformed (Dutch); b. at Overisel, Mich., Dec. 3, 1866. He was graduated at Hope College, Holland, Mich., in 1892 and Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Mich., in 1895. He was pastor of the Third Reformed Church, Holland, Mich., 1895–1904, and since 1904 has been professor of didactic and polemic theology in Western Theological Seminary. In theology he is in full sympathy with the symbols of the Reformed Church in America. His literary activity has thus far been confined to contributions to religious and theological papers and journals.

DUBBS, JOSEPH HENRY: Reformed (German); b. at North Whitehall, Pa., Oct. 5, 1838. He was graduated at Franklin and Marshall College in 1856, and Mercersburg Theological Seminary in 1859. He was pastor of Zion Reformed Church, Allentown, Pa. (1859–63), Trinity Reformed Church, Pottstown, Pa. (1863–71), and Christ Reformed Church, Philadelphia (1871–75), and from 1875 to 1906 was professor of history and archeology in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. He was acting president of his college in 1904, for fifteen years was secretary of its faculty, and since 1889 has been secretary of its board of trustees. He was corresponding delegate to the Lutheran General Synod in 1873 and to the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1891, as well as president of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States in 1893. In theology he adheres to the orthodox Christological position of his denomination. He was editor of the *Guardian* in 1882–86 and of the *Reformed Church Messenger* in 1894–95, and has written *Historic Manual of the Reformed Church* (Lancaster, 1885); *Home Ballads and Metrical Versions* (Philadelphia, 1888); *Why am I Reformed?* (1889); *History of the Reformed Church* (New York, 1895); *Leaders of the Reformation* (Philadelphia, 1900); *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania* (1902); and *History of Franklin and Marshall College* (Lancaster, 1903).

DU BOIS, WILLIAM EDWARD BURGHARDT: Protestant Episcopal layman; b. at Great Barrington, Mass., Feb. 23, 1868. He was educated at Fisk University (B.A., 1888), Harvard (Ph.D., 1895), and the University of Berlin, and after being fellow in sociology at Harvard in 1890–1902 and traveling fellow in 1892–94, was professor in Wilberforce University (1894–96), and assistant instructor in sociology in the University of Pennsylvania (1896–97). Since 1897 he has been professor of economics and history in Atlanta University. He was general secretary of the Niagara Movement from 1905 to 1908, and, while a communicant of the Episcopal Church, interprets "its creed very broadly, so broadly, in fact, that I ought not perhaps to be considered as a member." He has written: *Suppressions of the Slave Trade* (New York, 1896); *The Philadelphia Negro* (Philadelphia, 1899); *Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago, 1903); and *The Negro in the South* (in collaboration with B. T. Washington; Philadelphia, 1907).

DUBOSC, dü"bosc' (DU BOSC), PIERRE THOMINES: French Protestant preacher; b. at Bayeux (17 m. w.n.w. of Caen) Feb. 21, 1623; d. at Rotterdam Jan. 2, 1692. He was educated at Montauban and Saumur, and at the age of twenty-three became pastor of the Reformed congregation of Caen. He was one of the first preachers of his Church to discard dogmatic sermons in favor of appeals to the imagination and feelings of his hearers, and the majority of addresses contained in his two collections of sermons (2 vols., Rotterdam, 1692; 4 vols., 1701) are practical applications of Biblical facts and concepts. In 1663 he presided over the Synod of Rouen, but having incurred the hostility of the Roman Catholics, he was banished to Châlons, though he was soon allowed to return. In the persecutions which increased in severity after 1665 he rendered valuable aid to his Church by his courage and skill in his negotiations with the court, where he won the favor of Louis XIV. On June 6, 1685, however, a decree of the Parliament of Rouen forbade him to exercise his office in France, and he accordingly went to Holland, where the prince of Orange received him with great honor. His biography, together with a valuable collection of addresses, maxims, and sermons, was published by his son-in-law, Philippe Legendre, under the title *La Vie de Pierre Thomines, sieur du Bosc, ministre de Caen* (Rotterdam, 1694; enlarged ed., 1716). A series of his sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians was translated into English by J. B. Law, together with an introductory essay and a biographical sketch (London, 1853). (C. PFENDER.)

DU BOSE, WILLIAM PORCHER: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Winnsborough, S. C., Apr. 11, 1836. He was educated at the University of Virginia (M.A., 1859), and studied at the Divinity School at Camden, S. C., from 1859 to 1861. He then entered the Confederate Army, first as an adjutant and later as a chaplain, and served throughout the war, after which he was rector of St. John's, Winnsborough, in 1866–67, and of Trinity, Abbeville, S. C., in 1868–71. Since 1872 he has been connected with the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., chaplain in 1872–83, professor of moral theology and New Testament exegesis after 1872, and dean until his retirement in 1908. He has written *Soteriology of the New Testament* (New York, 1892; reissue, 1906); *The Ecumenical Councils* (1896); *The Gospel in the Gospels* (1906); and *The Gospel According to Saint Paul* (1907).

DUBOURG, dü"bür', ANNE: French Reformer; b. at Riom (17 m. n.e. of Puy-de-Dome) c. 1520; d. at Paris Dec. 23, 1559. After pursuing the practise of law, he became, about 1547, professor of civil law in the University of Orléans. In 1557 he was appointed *conseiller-clerc* to the Parliament of Paris. In his father's house he became acquainted with the doctrines of the Reformation, and at Orléans he had been in close sympathy with the Reformers, and had made a deep study of the Scriptures, the Fathers, and early church history before he embraced the new ideas. In 1558 he be-

gan to frequent the meetings of the Reformed congregation in Paris. In the Parliament most of the younger members inclined toward the Reformation; and of the older members some of the most prominent; as the president, Harlay, and Séguier, were in favor of a mild policy against heretics. There was, however, in the Parliament a party of extreme Roman Catholics led by Minard, Le Maistre, and St. André, and a conflict was not slow in arising. In order to arrive at some common policy, the procurator-general, Bourdin, convoked a plenary assembly of all the divisions of the Parliament, in Apr., 1559. When it became evident that the friends of the Reformation were in the majority, Minard, Le Maistre, and Bourdin addressed themselves directly to Henry II. The king appeared personally in the Parliament at the head of an imposing escort, and reproached it for lukewarmness in respect to the extirpation of heresy. Dubourg replied in a spirit of fearlessness, arguing that, while the heaviest transgressions against the divine law were allowed to go unpunished, the Parliament did wrong to devote its energies to the persecution of believers, who in the midst of the flames called upon the name of Christ. Personally incensed at this speech, which he construed as an allusion to his relations with Diane of Poitiers, Henry ordered the arrest of Dubourg. Legally, a member of the Parliament could be judged only by the Parliament itself. Nevertheless, the king appointed a commission of Dubourg's bitterest opponents to try the case. Dubourg appealed successively to the archbishops of Paris, Sens, and Lyons, but the appeals were not accepted. An appeal to the pope was still possible, but Dubourg refused to avail himself of it. The death of Henry II., July 10, 1559, made his situation still more desperate, as, by the accession of Francis II., the Guises came into power. All exertions of his friends, including Coligny, Condé, and the Elector-Palatine Frederick, who wished him to be released to take a professorship at Heidelberg, were in vain. Dubourg presented to his judges a confession of faith which was a masterly defense of the Reformation. Then for a moment he wavered, and under the influence of certain friends presented a second confession which was ambiguous, and was considered a surrender by his opponents; but he soon retracted, and, declaring his first confession to be the one which he actually believed, brought his fate upon himself. The verdict was given Dec. 1, and two days afterward he was strangled and burned. (THEODOR SCHOTT†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *La Vraye Histoire contenant l'inique jugement et fausse procédure contre Anne Dubourg*, Antwerp, 1561, reprinted in vol. i. of *Mémoires de Condé*, London, 1743; A. de la Roche-Chandieu, *Histoire des persécutions et martyrs de l'église de Paris, 1557-60*, Lyons, 1563; *Bulletin de l'histoire du protestantisme français*, vols. xxxvi.–xxxvii.; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 121–123, Paris, 1878.

DUCÆUS. See FRONTON DU DUC.

DU CANGE, dü cāṅzh, **CHARLES DU FRESNE, SEUR:** French historian and lexicographer; b. at Amiens (84 m. n. of Paris) Dec. 18, 1610; d. at Paris Aug. 16, 1688. He was educated at the Jesuit college of his native city, and studied law at the University of Orléans, after which he became treasurer of Amiens. His life was devoted, however, to the study of the Middle Ages, and his first work was his *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs français* (Paris, 1657). In 1668 the plague which raged in Amiens led him to remove to Paris, where he spent the remainder of his life. In considering the importance of the works of Du Cange it must be borne in mind that the Renaissance, with its admiration for Greece and Rome, and the Reformation had little sympathy with any study of the Middle Ages. Medieval Latin and the Romance languages had thus far found no investigator, nor was there any chronology, numismatics, archeology, paleography, or geography of that period. His writings, both printed and unprinted, embrace, on the other hand, not only the general history of medieval Europe, but also the history of France and the Byzantine Empire. His chief works are the *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis* (3 vols., 1678; enlarged edition in 6 vols., 1733-36; supplement by P. Carpentier, 4 vols., 1766; and by L. Diefenbach, Frankfort, 1857, 1867; abridgment with additions and corrections by J. C. Adelung, 6 vols., Halle, 1772–84; most recent edition of the *Glossarium*, including the additions of Carpentier, Adelung, and others, by L. Favre, 10 vols., Niort, 1883–87; a convenient abridgment in one vol. by W. H. Maigne d'Arnis, Paris, 1866) and the *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Græcitatis* (2 vols., Lyons, 1688). Both these dictionaries are true encyclopedias, one for Latin Christendom in all its ecclesiastical, political, and social aspects, and the other for the Byzantine Empire, to say nothing of their lexicographical value. In the preface to the Latin *Glossarium*, moreover, the author gives the history of the decay of the Latin language and sketches the earliest developments of French. The last work of Du Cange, which was not completed until after his death, was his edition of the *Chronicon paschale* (Paris, 1688). (C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. Faugère, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Du Cange*, Paris, 1852; H. Hardouin, *Essai sur la vie et sur les ouvrages de Du Cange*, ib. 1849.

DUCEY, THOMAS JAMES: Roman Catholic; b. at Lismore (111 m. s.s.w. of Dublin), County Cork, Ireland, Feb. 4, 1843. He went to the United States at the age of five, and was graduated at St. Francis Xavier's College, New York City, in 1864, and at the Provincial Seminary, Troy, N. Y., in 1868. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1868, and in 1869 was attached to the staff of the Church of the Nativity, New York City, where he incurred the opposition of the Tweed ring by his denunciations of municipal corruption. In 1872 he was transferred to St. Michael's in the same city, and in the following year began the active organization of societies for Roman Catholic young men. In 1880 he founded St. Leo's Church. He was assistant chaplain in the City Prison for several years, and is active in movements against political evil and in philanthropic enterprises.

DUCHESNE, dü''shên', **LOUIS MARIE OLIVIER:** French Roman Catholic; b. at St. Servan (100 m. n. of Nantes) Sept. 13, 1843. He studied in Paris and at Rome from 1873 to 1876, visiting Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia, and Mt. Athos in 1874, and

making a tour of Asia Minor in 1876. From 1877 to 1895 he was professor of church history in the Institut Catholique de Paris, and since the latter year has been director of the French school at Rome. He was also maître de conférences and later directeur d'études at the École des Hautes Études, Paris, 1885–95, and in 1888 was elected a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. He has written *De Macario Magnete et scriptis ejus* (Paris, 1877); *Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis* (1877); *Mémoire sur une mission au Mont Athos* (1877; in collaboration with C. Bayet); *Vita Sancti Polycarpi auctore Pionio* (1881); *Le Liber Pontificalis: Texte, introduction et commentaire* (2 vols., 1886-92); *Origines du culte chrétien* (1889; Eng. transl. by M. L. McClure under the title *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, London, 1902); *Les Anciens Catalogues épiscopaux de la province de Tours* (1890); *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* (2 vols., 1894–99); *Autonomies ecclésiastiques* (1896); *Les Premiers Temps de l'état pontifical* (1898); *Le Forum chrétien* (Rome, 1899); *Autonomies ecclésiastiques; églises séparées* (1904; Eng. transl., *Churches Separated from Rome*, New York, 1908).

DUDITH, dū-dît' (DUDICH, DUDICS), ANDREAS: Hungarian bishop, later a Protestant; b. at Budapest Feb. 16, 1533; d. at Breslau Feb. 23, 1589. He was educated by his uncle, who was canon at Breslau, and went to Italy about 1550 to continue his studies. There he gained the favor of Cardinal Pole, whom he accompanied on his return to England after the accession of Queen Mary. He was an excellent Latin scholar and had meanwhile been appointed canon at Gran, but in 1558 he again devoted himself to study in Padua. He was appointed bishop of Tininium (Knin) in Dalmatia by the emperor Ferdinand, and took part in the Council of Trent, where, in compliance with the wish of Ferdinand, he urged that the cup be given to the laity. Although he did not appear there as an opponent of the celibacy of the clergy, he wrote a *Demonstratio pro libertate conjugii*. Being appointed bishop, first of Fünfkirchen, and then of Szigeth, he went to Poland in 1565, where he married a maid of honor of the queen, and resigned his see, becoming an adherent of Protestantism. In 1575 he became so involved in political intrigues to secure the throne of Poland (then vacant) for Maximilian that his opponents confiscated his estates and expelled him from the city. The last ten years of his life were spent at Breslau. Five orations and a brief biography of Dudith were published at Offenbach in 1610 by Quirinus Reuter. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the biography by Reuter, there is available C. B. Stieff, *Versuch einer . . Geschichte von Leben und Meinungen Andreas Duditha*, Breslau, 1756.

DUDLEY, THOMAS UNDERWOOD: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Kentucky; b. at Richmond, Va., Sept. 26, 1837; d. in New York City Jan. 22, 1904. He studied at the University of Virginia (B.A., 1858), where he was professor of Latin and Greek until the outbreak of the Civil War. He then entered the Confederate Army and attained the rank of major. After the close of the war he studied theology at the Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., from which he was graduated in 1867. He was ordered deacon in 1867 and ordained priest in 1868. He was curate and rector of Christ Church, Baltimore, 1869–75, and in 1875 was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Kentucky. On the death of Bishop B. B. Smith in 1884 he became diocesan of Kentucky. He wrote *A Wise Discrimination the Church's Need* (New York, 1881); and *Why am I a Churchman?* (1894).

DUEL. See WAGER OF BATTLE.

DUESTERDIECK, dū-''ester-dîk', FRIEDRICH HERMANN CHRISTIAN: German Protestant; b. at Hanover July 14, 1822; d. there Apr. 23, 1906. He studied in Göttingen and Berlin and was lecturer at Göttingen 1846–48, director of studies at the theological seminary at Hanover 1848–54, pastor at Schwichelt 1854–58, and director of studies at Loccum 1858-65. In 1865 he was appointed consistorial councilor at Hanover, and became councilor of the supreme consistory seven years later, while from 1879 until his retirement from active life in 1900 he was general superintendent. He wrote *Quæ de Ignatianarum epistolarum anthentia duorumque textuum ratione et dignitate huc usque prolatæ sunt sententiæ* (Göttingen, 1843); *De rei propheticæ natura ethica* (1852); *Die weltliche Bildung des Geistlichen* (Hanover, 1873); *Die Revision der Luther'schen Bibelübersetzung* (1882); *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannes* (Göttingen); and *Inspiration und Kritik der heiligen Schrift* (1896).

DUFF, ALEXANDER: First missionary of the Church of Scotland to India; b. at the farmhouse of Auchnahyle, Moulin (25 m. n.n.w. of Perth), Perthshire, Apr. 25, 1806; d. in Edinburgh Feb. 12, 1878. He studied at the grammar-school of Perth and the University of St. Andrews under Dr. Chalmers and others, and was licensed and sailed for Calcutta in 1829, losing all his books by shipwreck on the way. He resolved to make an educational institution a leading feature of his work in India, and had the valuable support of an enlightened Hindu for his school in Calcutta, which was conducted on two principles—first that the Christian Scriptures should be read in every class able to read them, and second that through the English language Western science should be taught, notwithstanding the revolution it must cause in many Hindu notions. Duff prepared various textbooks, including one on Christian ethics and the elements of political economy. His school rapidly became popular and influential. The teaching of English, however, roused opposition among the European residents, including some of the earlier missionaries, and his whole method brought him into conflict with the Hindu College, already established, which aimed to avoid offense to Indian sentiment by maintaining a secularist atmosphere. Duff won the confidence of the governor, Lord William Bentinck, and T. B. Macaulay (afterward Lord Macaulay) added his powerful advocacy to the cause of English education; eventually the neutrality of government guaranteed security for

Christian work as well as for Indian customs. With growing knowledge of India Duff made his influence felt in every social movement, and ultimately as editor of the *Calcutta Review* he was one of the chief unofficial factors in politics and administration, his advice being listened to with respect both by the authorities in India and commissions at home.

Returning to Scotland in ill health in 1834, Duff made a tour of the country and much increased the interest in his mission, though met by apathy at first. His addresses in the General Assembly were truly eloquent, and he was felt to be the equal of Chalmers. Attempts were made to keep him in Scotland, but he returned to India and prosecuted his work there. At the disruption of the Scottish Church in 1843, like all other missionaries, he threw in his lot with the Free Church. As the property of the mission belonged legally to the Establishment, Duff was stripped of everything, but friends rallied to his support with the result that the efficiency of the work was immediately doubled. The storms that were stirred up by the conversions which took place from time to time were safely weathered, and the college still remains one of the leading educational institutions of India. At the General Assemblies of the Established and the United Free Churches of Scotland held in May, 1907, steps were taken to unite the two missionary colleges founded in Calcutta by Dr. Duff. The happy consummation of this union in the foreign field is being hailed as the first step toward the final reunion of Scottish Presbyterianism. In 1850 Duff again returned home, and sought to rouse the Free Church to new and more energetic efforts in the cause of missions. He was called in 1851 to the chair of the General Assembly. He also visited America in 1854, under the auspices of Mr. George H. Stuart, of Philadelphia, and made a deep impression both in Canada and the United States.

He went back to India, and continued his labors for some years; but, his health failing, he returned permanently to Scotland in 1864. Appointed convener of the Foreign Missions Committee, he had the chief management of the foreign work of the Free Church and has left his mark on its business details. He showed his catholicity by the deep interest he took in South African missions, and especially by the share he had in organizing the Livingstonia mission on Lake Nyassa. In 1867 he was appointed first professor of Evangelistic theology in the Free Church.

Dr. Duff took an active interest in many important movements of the home Church. He was an active promoter of the proposed union of the Free, United Presbyterian, Reformed Presbyterian, and English Presbyterian churches, which, however, fell through. He was moderator a second time in 1873. To the end his advice and countenance were sought alike by Indian statesmen and by all manner of religious societies in England as well as Scotland. His principal publications related to the India mission.

(R. W. Stewart) Thomas M. Lindsay.

Bibliography: Consult the biographies of George Smith, London, 1899; J. Marrat, in *Two Standard Bearers in the East*, ib. 1882; Thomas Smith, in *Men Worth Remembering*, ib. 1883. Further: Lal Behari Day, *Recollections of A. Duff*, ib. 1879; W. P. Duff, *Memorials of Alexander Duff*, ib. 1890 (by his son).

DUFF, ARCHIBALD: English Congregationalist; b. at Fraserburgh (37 m. n. of Aberdeen), Aberdeenshire, Scotland, Sept. 26, 1845. He studied at McGill University, Montreal (B.A., 1864), Andover Theological Seminary (B.D., 1872), and the universities of Halle (1872–74) and Göttingen (1874–75). He was head master of Dunham Academy, Quebec, 1864–65, professor of mathematics in St. Francis College, Richmond, Quebec, 1865–67, and assistant master of the high-school at Montreal 1867–69. He was Biblical lecturer in the Congregational College, Montreal, 1875–76, temporary professor of Hebrew in McGill College, 1876–77, and mathematical lecturer in the same institution 1876–78. Since 1878 he has been professor of Old Testament theology in the United College (Congregational), Bradford, Yorkshire. He was chairman of the Yorkshire Congregational Union in 1893, and a city councilor of Bradford in 1904–06. In theology he is an exponent of the strict scientific and historical study of Hebrew religion and Christianity. He was coeditor of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* in 1874–94, and has written *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols., London, 1891–1900); *Hebrew Grammar* (1901); *Hebrew Theology and Ethics* (1902); *First and Second Esdras*, in *The Temple Apocrypha* (1903); and *Abraham and the Patriarchal Age* (1903).

DUFFIELD, GEORGE: Presbyterian; b. at Carlisle, Pa., Sept. 12, 1818; d. at Bloomfield, N. J., July 6, 1888. He was graduated at Yale in 1837, and at Union Theological Seminary in 1840. He held pastorates at Brooklyn, N. Y. (1840–47), Bloomfield, N. J. (1847–52), Philadelphia (1852–1861), Adrian, Mich. (1861–65), Galesburg, Ill. (1865–1869), and Saginaw City, Mich. (1869–74). He was then an Evangelist at Ann Arbor, Mich. (1874–77), and after a ministry at Lansing, Mich. (1877–80), retired from active service. He is best known as a writer of hymns, especially the familiar "Stand up, stand up for Jesus."

DUFFIELD, SAMUEL AUGUSTUS WILLOUGHBY: Presbyterian; b. in Brooklyn Sept. 23, 1843; d. at Bloomfield, N. J., May 12, 1887. He was graduated at Yale (1863), and in 1866 was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry. He held pastorates at the Tioga Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia (1867–70), Claremont Presbyterian Church, Jersey City, N. J. (1870–71), Ann Arbor, Mich. (1871–74), Eighth Church, Chicago (1874–76), Central Church, Auburn, N. Y. (1876–78), Second Church, Altoona, Pa. (1878–82), and Bloomfield, N. J. (1882–87). He translated a cento from the *De contemptu mundi* of Bernard of Cluny under the title *The Heavenly Land* (New York, 1867), and wrote *English Hymns: Their Authors and History* (1886) and *Latin Hymn-Writers and their Hymns* (1889; edited after the author's death by R. E. Thompson). He was the son of George Duffield, and likewise a hymn-writer.

DU FRESNE, dü frên. See Du Cange.

DU GUET, dü gê **(DUGUET), JACQUES JOSEPH:** French Oratorian and Jansenist; b. at Montbrison (234 m. s.s.e. of Paris) Dec. 9, 1649; d. at Paris Oct. 25, 1733. In 1667 he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, where he received his education, and also lectured in the church of St. Roch at Paris on the history and discipline of the Church in various periods, his addresses being printed under the title *Conférences ecclésiastiques* (2 vols., Cologne, 1742). When the Oratorians were required to sign a condemnation of Jansenism and Cartesianism in 1686, Du Guet fled to Brussels, and lived for a time with A. Arnauld in the Spanish Netherlands, remaining in constant communication with Paschasius Quesnel and editing his *Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament* (8 vols., Paris, 1693–1700). His strict adherence to Augustinianism was shown by his *Réfutation du système de Nicole touchant la grâce universelle* (1716) and by his repeated protests against the bull *Unigenitus*, although, on the other hand, he opposed all Jansenistic excesses, especially the *convulsionnaires*. After working for many years in various places of concealment, he returned to Paris, where he spent the remainder of his life. Among his numerous works special mention may be made of the following: *Traité de la prière publique et des dispositions pour offrir les saints mystères* (1707); *Règles pour l'intelligence des Saintes Écritures* (1716); *Lettre sur divers sujets de morale et de piété* (3 vols., 1718; later extended to ten vols.); *Explication du mystère de la passion* (2 vols., 1722; extended to 14 vols. in the edition of 1733); *Explication de la Genèse* (5 vols., 1732); and many interpretations of various books of the Old Testament. His *Institution d'un prince* (London, 1739) was translated into English in 1740, and an English version of his *Traité des principes de la foi chrétienne* (3 vols., Paris, 1736) appeared in 2 vols. at Edinburgh in 1755. Du Guet ranked as one of the best Jansenist authors, and was regarded as uniting the logic of Nicole with the grace of Fénelon.

(C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The edition of Du Guet's *Institution d'un prince* by Goujet, 1739, ut sup., contains a biography.

DU HALDE, dü hāld', **JEAN BAPTISTE:** French Jesuit; b. in Paris Feb. 1, 1674; d. there Aug. 18, 1743. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1708, and succeeded Father Legobien as editor of the letters written by the foreign missionaries of the order. He edited vols. ix.–xxvi., inclusive, and published an excellent résumé of letters from China under the title, *Description géographique, historique de l'empire de la Chine* (4 vols., Paris, 1735, Eng. transl., *The General History of China*, 4 vols., London, 1736).

DUHM, dūhm, **BERNARD LAWARD:** German Protestant; b. at Bingum, East Frisia, Holland, Oct. 10, 1847. He studied in Göttingen (Ph.D., 1870), where he was tutor in the theological seminary 1871–72, and privat-docent for Old Testament theology 1873–77. From 1877 to 1889 he was associate professor of Old Testament theology in Göttingen, and since 1889 has been professor of the same subject at Basel and instructor in Hebrew at the gymnasium of Basel. He has written *Pauli apostoli de lege judicia dijudicata* (Göttingen, 1873); *Theologie der Propheten* (Bonn, 1875); *Ueber Ziel und Methode der theologischen Wissenschaft* (Basel, 1889); *Kosmologie und Religion* (1892); *Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen, 1892); *Das Geheimniss in der Religion* (Freiburg, 1896); *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (1897); *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt* (1897); *Das Buch Hiob erklärt* (1897); *Die Psalmen übersetzt* (1899); *Die Psalmen erklärt* (1899); *Das Buch Jeremia erklärt* (1901); and *Das Buch Jeremia übersetzt* (1903).

DUKHOBORS: A Russian sect, first heard of in the latter half of the eighteenth century, when they attracted attention by their rejection of the Church, the priesthood, and the sacraments.

Tenets and Early History.

They proclaimed the equality and brotherhood of man. The Czar and all his officials, as well as the priests and metropolitans, were regarded as usurping a power to which they had no moral right. War and taxation, as well as law-courts and all police regulation, were condemned. The Bible was mystically interpreted, and not regarded as having so high an authority as the "Living Book" (which may be taken to mean either "the Voice Within" or the oral traditions taught by the leaders of the sect). Wealth and commerce were condemned. The laborious, agricultural life of a Russian peasant in his village commune was considered to be the only good life. None of these ideas was peculiar to the Dukhobors. They had all previously found expression among one or other of allied religious groups—Lollards, Hussites, Moravian Brethren, Mennonites, Anabaptists, Quakers, or the Eastern Paulicians and Bogomiles.

The history of the Dukhobors, however, differentiated them from other sects because, after much persecution, in the reign of Alexander I. (1801–25) they were allowed to come together from all parts of Russia and form a clan. Their place of settlement was "Milky Waters," near the Sea of Azov. Here they had to face the problem of arranging their practical affairs as a group, under their new conditions. The need of a government to regulate both their civil and religious affairs, as well as to negotiate with the Russian authorities (whom they regarded as the Hebrews in Egypt regarded Pharaoh), was at once urgently felt; and without altering the phraseology of their old anarchist beliefs, or being conscious of inconsistency, they instinctively proceeded to establish, and submit to, one of the most absolute despotisms on record.

Kapoústin.

Their first leader at "Milky Waters" was a former non-commissioned officer named Kapoústin, a man of ability and force of character. He managed the sect-clan with remarkable success; but he taught that he was a reincarnation of Christ, and that his divine authority would descend to his heirs and successors. His followers, however, were never, in conversation with officials or other "Gentiles," to acknowledge that they had any earthly leader.

This curious secretiveness, the outcome of much persecution, still remains characteristic of the clan. They systematically throw dust in the eyes of all inquirers as to the nature of their internal government; and this has led to endless confusion and misunderstandings among those who, lacking the real clue to the situation, have attempted to study the sect. Kapoústin established community of property, and maintained that system for many years; but ultimately he terminated it in a manner which left him and his family in control of large communal estates. His immediate successors, his son and grandson, supported by an oligarchy of thirty elders, grossly misbehaved and appear to have terrorized their opponents by a series of secret assassinations carried on under the maxim: "Whoso denies his God shall perish by the sword."

In 1841–44 the Russian Government, after a prolonged investigation into these crimes, banished the sect to the Caucasus. Here they lived quiet, industrious lives till the death of L. V. Kalmikóva, who had succeeded to power on the death of her husband, Peter, the great-grandson of Kapoústin. This woman had shown favor to a young man, Peter Verígin, who belonged to the ruling family, and whom she probably intended to appoint as her successor. However, after a quarrel with him she died suddenly, without having made the appointment, and strife broke out in the sect. The majority acknowledged Peter Verígin as leader, but an influential minority (including those who had managed affairs under Kalmikóva) refused to do so. The Russian authorities, in 1887, banished Verígin to Archangel for five years, and at the end of that time sent him to Siberia. In exile Verígin became acquainted with Leo Tolstoy's teaching; and, recognizing in it much that corresponded to the original Dukhobor doctrines, he "advised" (his advice amounting to a command) his followers to rename themselves "The Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood"; further (1) to refuse military service; (2) to divide up their property equally; (3) to cease killing animals for food, and abstain from intoxicants and tobacco; (4) to refrain from sexual relations during their time of tribulation (i.e., during the persecution which arose in connection with his leadership). About this time Tolstoy made the acquaintance of some of Verígin's adherents; and, being misled by them as to the real state of the case, wrote a series of articles which ignored the fact of Verígin's theocratic authority, and represented the Dukhobors as an example of a sect of peaceful anarchists, who conducted their affairs without a government of any kind, except that of their own reason and conscience. Verígin's advice led to a fresh split in the sect. Nearly half his followers, finding his demands too severe, seceded, while the rest accepted them and entered on a campaign of passive resistance against conscription for army-service.

Peter Verígin.

In 1898 the loyal Veríginite Dukhobors were allowed to migrate to Canada, and, having secured from the Canadian government a pledge that they should be exempt from all forms of conscription, 7,363 of them arrived there in 1899. Verígin being still in exile, and they being unwilling or unable without him to decide on what lines the new life should be arranged, great confusion arose, leading ultimately to a strange pilgrimage which set out to meet Verígin when the news of his release from Siberia was at last received. After his arrival in Canada, in 1902, the clan gave the government less difficulty; but owing to their unwillingness to own allegiance to any one but Verígin, and their consequent reluctance to become British subjects, there was still some friction. More than 1,000 Dukhobors have now broken away from Verígin's community, and the superstitious reverence for him has much decreased. It is only the more ignorant members, especially some of the women and children, who still regard him as a superman.

The Dukhobors in Canada.

The Dukhobors are remarkably honest, sober, temperate, and frugal, and they are also generally industrious, well-mannered, self-respecting, and hospitable to strangers. Their differences with the Canadian government have all pivoted on the question of Verígin's leadership, and have been increased by the extraordinary duplicity and mendacity which they never scruple to practise in order to screen their leader from responsibility for the consequences of actions they take at his prompting. Allowance should, however, be made for the difficulties experienced by members of a sect-clan who had always been accustomed to a communal or semicommunal way of life in which public affairs were managed for them, and who suddenly found themselves in a land of individual enterprise and democratic institutions, the laws and language of which they did not understand.

AYLMER MAUDE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The only full account yet published is by A. Maude, *A Peculiar People: the Doukhobors*, New York, 1904. Further references are: Stepniak, *The Russian Peasantry*, London, 1894; *Christian Martyrdom in Russia*, ed. V. Tchertkoff, with chapter by L. Tolstoy, ib. 1897; L. Tolstoy, in London *Daily Chronicle*, Apr. 29, 1898; idem, *Essays and Letters*, in *World's Classics Series*, ib. 1903; J. Elkinton, *The Doukhobors, their Hist. in Russia, their Migration to Canada*, Philadelphia, 1903 (better on the Canadian episode than in the other part). Material is also to be found in: *Life . of William Allen*, London, 1847; *Life . of Stephen Grellett*, ed. Seebohm, ib. 1862; *Canadian Magazine*, xx (1903), 211 sqq. The fully authoritative work on the sect in Russia will be K. K. Grass, *Die russischen Sekten*, vol. iii., Leipsic, not yet out. Consult also the literature under RUSSIA.

DULCINO, DULCINISTS. See DOLCINO.

DULIA (Latinized form of the Gk. *douleia*, "servitude, service"): The name technically applied in Roman Catholic theology to the veneration accorded to the saints and angels, and sharply distinguished (in kind, not alone in degree) from *latria* (Gk. *latreia*), or the worship due to God alone. *Hyperdulia* is a somewhat higher degree of veneration paid to the Virgin Mary on account of her intimate relation to God. Dulia is expressed by external acts of reverence and by invocation, and may be extended, in the former shape at least, to objects closely connected with the saints, such as their garments and other relics and their images, which

are, however, venerated not for any intrinsic virtue of their own, but only with respect to those whom they represent or with whom they are associated. See SAINTS, VENERATION OF.

DULLES, dul'ez, **JOSEPH HEATLY**: Presbyterian; b. at Philadelphia, Pa., May 27, 1853. He was educated at Princeton College (B. A., 1873) and Princeton Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1877. After pastoral service at home (1877–83) and travel and study in Europe (1883–85), he became librarian of Princeton Theological Seminary (1886). He is a member of the American Historical Association, honorary secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund for New Jersey, an editor of the *Princeton Theological Review*. In theology he is a conservative. He compiled the general catalogue of Princeton Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, 1894) and James McCosh bibliography (Princeton, 1895), and edited the proceedings of William Henry Green's jubilee as instructor in Princeton Theological Seminary, contributing Professor Green's bibliography (New York, 1896).

DU MOULIN, dü mū''lañ', **CHARLES**: French jurist; b. in Paris 1500; d. there Dec. 27, 1566. He became an advocate in 1522, but gave up pleading because of a defect of speech. He joined the Reformed congregation in 1542. Later he became famous as a consulting lawyer. In 1551 he published his *Commentaire sur l'Édit des petites dates* to show that Henry II. was right in forbidding the exportation of gold and silver from his kingdom to Rome. The argument was effective, and the pope dropped the question so far as Henry was concerned, but he had the author tried for heresy. This resulted in the flight of Du Moulin; and from this time till his death he was pursued by the Roman Church, being forced to move from one place to another. Finally he returned to Paris, where he was prevailed upon to publish his *Conseil sur le fait du Concile de Trente* (Lyons, 1564). The book was condemned and Du Moulin was imprisoned; but he was afterward released through the efforts of Jeanne d'Albret.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Brodeau, *La Vie de Maistre C. Du Moulin*, Paris, 1654; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 137–138.

DU MOULIN, PIERRE (Molinæus): Celebrated preacher, professor, organizer, and controversialist of the French Reformed Church; b. at the château of Buhyin, Normandy (department of Seine-et-Oise), Oct. 18, 1568; d. at Sédan Mar. 10, 1658. His father, Joachim du Moulin, a Protestant preacher, after the Third Religious War took refuge at Buhy, which belonged to the family of Du Plessis-Mornay, and Pierre was born in the same room as Philippe du Plessis-Mornay (q.v.). After St. Bartholomew's Night (Aug. 24, 1572) the family, then settled at Soissons, was again obliged to flee, and, under the protection of the duke of Bouillon, reached Sédan. Here Pierre began his studies in the academy. In 1588 his father took him to Paris, and, declaring that he could no longer support his son, left with him twelve gulden in his purse. Paris not being safe at the time, Pierre went to England and spent four years in London, where he ultimately became tutor to the young dukes of Rutland. He accompanied his pupils to Cambridge and Oxford and heard lectures in theology and philosophy from Whitaker and Reynolds. His maiden sermon at the Huguenot Church of London was a success. In 1592 he went to Holland and became, first, lecturer on ancient languages, then professor of philosophy and Greek in the University of Leyden. He lived in Scaliger's house and had Hugo Grotius among his pupils. In 1598, after dedicating to the hospitable Leyden university a *Panegyricus Bataviæ*, he returned to France, and in December was ordained at Gien, where his father was then living. In March, 1599, he became minister of the Reformed congregation at Charenton, where he remained twenty-one years, faithful in danger and noted for eloquence. Catherine of Bourbon, sister of Henry IV. and wife of Duke Henry of Bar (a Roman Catholic), made him her chaplain, and he spent two months of each year with her at her residence in Lorraine. Perhaps his greatest celebrity was gained by his controversies both with Roman Catholics and Calvinists. Noteworthy among the former were (1) those with Palma-Cayet (1602), who tried to convert Catherine to Roman Catholicism (cf. *Narré de la conférence verbale et par escrit tenue entre M. P du Moulin et M. Cayet par Archibald Adair, gentilhomme écossais* (Geneva, 1625); (2) with De Beaulieu about the mass and the doctrine of the Church; (3) with the Jesuit P. Coton concerning the teachings and morals of the Jesuits (1606–07); (4) with the priests Gontier (1610) and Coeffeteau (1625) on transubstantiation (see list of works below). His principal controversies with Reformed theologians were (1) with D. Tilenus, professor at Sédan, on the *ubiquitas corporis Christi;* (2) with the Arminians, against whom he wrote his *Anatome Arminianismi* (Leyden, 1619); (3) against Amyraut and his school. By invitation of James I. of England he went to London in 1615, promising his Paris congregation to return in three months, and James proposed to him to attempt to unite all Protestants. Shortly after his return a Jesuit, Arnoux, preached before King Louis XIII., maintaining that the Scripture passages on which the Calvinist creed was founded were wrongly interpreted. In reply Du Moulin produced his two most celebrated works, *La Défense de la religion chrétienne* and *Le Bouclier de la foy* (Charenton, 1617; Eng. transl. of the latter, *The Buckler of the Faith; or, A Defense of the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches in France*, London, 1620; 3d ed., 1631). This controversy exasperated both parties and Du Moulin had to flee to Sédan, where he became pastor, professor, and tutor of the young duke of Bouillon. His oldest son, Pierre du Moulin (b. at Paris Apr. 24, 1601; d. at Canterbury, England, Oct. 10, 1684), lived in England, and died as chaplain to Charles II. and prebendary of Canterbury. He wrote a number of theological tracts.

The most important of the elder Du Moulin's numerous writings, not already mentioned, were: *Défense de la foi catholique contenue au livre du roi Jacques I, contre la réponse de Coeffeteau* (La Rochelle, 1604); *Apologie pour la Sainte Cène du Seigneur, contre la présence corporelle ou transsub-*

stantiation (1607; Eng. transl., London, 1612); *De l'accomplissement des prophéties* (1612; Eng. transl., Oxford, 1613); *Copie de la lettre écrite contre Tilenus aux ministres de France* (Paris, 1613); *De la vocation des pasteurs* (Sédan, 1618); *Nouveauté du papisme opposée à l'antiquité du vrai christianisme* (1627); *Abrégé des controverses, ou sommaire des erreurs de l'église romaine* (1636); *Du juge des controverses* (1630). G. BONET-MAURY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Du Moulin's *Autobiographie*, ed. C. Read, is given in *Bulletin de la société d'histoire du protestantisme français*, vii. 170 sqq.; J. Aymon, *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France*, The Hague, 1710; A. Vinet, *Histoire de la prédication parmi les réformés en France*, Paris, 1860; H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, vol. i. passim, New York, 1895; P. de Félice, *Les Protestants d'autrefois*, vol. i. passim, Paris, 1897.

DUNCAN, JOHN: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Aberdeen 1796; d. at Edinburgh Feb. 26, 1870. He was graduated from the University of Aberdeen in 1814, then studied theology at Edinburgh and was licensed to preach in 1825. In 1836 he was ordained to the charge of Milton Church, Glasgow. In 1841 he was appointed the first missionary of the committee of the Church of Scotland for the conversion of the Jews. After spending two years in Budapest he returned to Scotland to become professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages at New College, Edinburgh. He published an edition of E. Robinson's *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1838) and a few lectures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Knight, *Colloquia Peripatetica by the late John Duncan*, Edinburgh, 1879; A. M. Stuart, *Recollections of the late John Duncan*, ib. 1872; D. Brown, *Life of the late John Duncan*, ib. 1872; idem, *John Duncan in the Pulpit and at the Communion Table*, ib. 1874.

DUNGAL: The name of several ecclesiastics of the early Middle Ages. A Celtic bishop Dungal is mentioned by Alcuin, but is scarcely identical with the monk Dungal of St. Denis, who is never termed a bishop. This monk was the author of a number of letters and poems. Of the former the first is dated in 811, the next five during the reign of Charlemagne, the seventh after the death of that monarch, and the eighth either in his reign or in that of Louis the Pious. Dungal is named in only two of the poems, but he has been regarded as the chief author of the poems emanating from St. Denis. His writings show him to have been a man of unusual attainments and a scion of a wealthy Scotch-Irish family, although on the Continent he lived in needy circumstances. He apparently left his home about 784 or 787, since the twelfth St. Denis poem was written at the earliest in the former year, and the second in or shortly after the latter date. Charlemagne valued Dungal's learning highly, and requested him to explain the eclipse of the sun in 810 and to criticize the *De substantia nihili et tenebris an sint* of Fridugis. Dungal was thus naturally an enthusiastic panegyrist of the emperor.

It is uncertain whether this Dungal was the author of the *Responsa contra perversas Claudii sententias*, written at the request of Lothair in 827. It seems more probable, however, that this work was composed by a third Dungal, whom Lothair mentions in 825 as a teacher of the school of Pavia, though so little is known regarding this teacher that the question can not be decided. Despite their polemics against Claudius of Turin, the *Responsa* adhere in the main to the Carolingian theology. A fourth Dungal, of somewhat later date, was the author of another poem from St. Denis, while a fifth, who seems to belong to the eleventh century, presented numerous books to Bobbio. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ*, ed. E. Dümmler, are in *MGH, Epist. sæc. xiii.*, iv (1892), 568 sqq.; the *Carmina*, ed. E. Dümmler, in *MGH, Poetæ Latini ævi Carolini*, i (1881), 393 sqq., ii (1884), 664–665; cf. Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1893), 153, and Traube, *AMA*, philosophische Classe, xix. 332 sqq.

DUNIN, dū'nin, MARTIN VON: Archbishop of Posen and Gnesen; b. at Wat, near Rawa (45 m. s.w. of Warsaw), in Poland, Nov. 11, 1774; d. in Posen Dec. 26, 1842. He was the son of a landed gentleman, and studied at the Collegium Germanicum in Rome. After he had fulfilled various positions as a clergyman he became suffragan bishop to Archbishop Theophilus von Wolicki in Posen and succeeded him in the archbishopric in 1831. His significance lies in the controversy between the Roman Church and the Prussian government concerning mixed marriages (see DROSTE-VISCHERING). The usage in Posen was lenient until the appearance of the brief of Pius VIII., dated Mar. 25, 1830 (Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 350–353). Dunin wished to enforce this brief in Posen, or to petition the Curia for special directions concerning mixed marriages in his archdiocese. The Prussian government refused both requests. After the allocution of Gregory XVI. on Dec. 10, 1837, relative to Droste-Vischering (q.v.) had become known, on his own responsibility Dunin forbade his clergy, under penalty of suspension, to assist at any mixed marriage, unless the education of the children in the Roman faith had previously been promised. He stood by the position taken in his circulars even against the authority of the royal ministerium. Thereupon a suit was brought against him, although he maintained that the case should not come under the cognizance of the civil court, and the clergy refused to give their testimony. On his side there stood the prince bishop of Ermland, Stanislaus von Hatten, and Bishop Sedlag of Kulm, but not the Prince Bishop Sedlnitzky of Breslau. The sentence of the higher court of appeals in Posen, pronounced in 1839 against the archbishop for exceeding his official power, gave him six months' imprisonment in a fortress and removal from office. For the first punishment the king substituted the requirement that he should stay in Berlin until the controversy was settled. Nevertheless, Dunin left the capital secretly and returned to Posen to resume the functions of his office. On Oct. 8, 1839, he was arrested and brought to the fortress of Kolberg, where he stayed until the king died. Frederick William IV. set him free and even restored him to office after he had modified his obnoxious regulations. The government, however, was not able to secure any recognition of the old milder usage. On the whole, Dunin's actions did not have the same importance as the procedure of Droste-Vischering, although his cathedral chapter, the diocesan clergy,

and the nobility stood manfully by him and the antithesis of Polish and German national feeling entered into the contest. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. F. Jacobson, *Ueber die gemischten Ehen in Deutschland und insbesondere in Preussen*, Leipsic, 1838; K. G. N. Rintel, *Verteidigung des . Martin von Dunin*, Würzburg, 1839; K. Hase, *Die beiden Erzbischöfe*, pp. 153–200, Leipsic, 1839; F. Pohl, *Martin von Dunin*, Marienburg, 1843; H. Schmid, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands*, Munich, 1874; H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands*, vol. ii., Leipsic, 1903.

DUNKERS (DUNKARDS, TUNKERS).

I. History to the Separation of 1882 and the Main Body or Conservative Dunkers since that Date.
Origin in Germany (§ 1).
Emigration to America (§ 2).
Development 1783–1882 (§ 3).
The Ministry (§ 4).
Creed, Government, and Present Condition (§ 5).
The Division of 1882 (§ 6).
II. The Progressive Dunkers.
Fundamental Cause of Separation (§ 1).
Organization and Present Status (§ 2).
Doctrine and Practise (§ 3).
III. The Old Order Brethren.

The Dunkers are a denomination of Christian Reformers which originated in Germany in 1708, and in 1719 and following years emigrated to America. The name is from the German *tunken*, "to dip," signifying their method of baptizing. Among themselves they are known as Brethren. The corporate and official name is German Baptist Brethren. Since 1882 there have been three branches: the Conservative Dunkers, Progressive Dunkers, and Old Order Brethren. For the Seventh-day Baptists, German, who were originally a secession from the Dunkers, see COMMUNISM, II., 5.

I. History to the Separation of 1882 and the Main Body or Conservative Dunkers since that Date: Prior to 1708 there was a religious awakening in Europe, many earnest and pious people believing that the Lutheran Reformation did not reproduce the ideal Christianity demanded by the New Testament Scriptures. This condition prompted Alexander Mack (b. in Schriesheim—in Baden, 5 m. n.n.w. of Heidelberg—Germany, 1679; d. at Germantown, Pa., Jan. 18, 1735) and several others of like convictions, residing at Schwarzenau in Wittgenstein, Westphalia, to study the Scriptures independent of all creeds and to submit themselves wholly to the guidance of the Word. Mack was a Calvinist, and well-to-do miller at this time. Knowing of no religious body, accepting the teaching of the New Testament as it appealed to them, they agreed to enter upon a life of obedience to the Word as they understood it, form a society of religious believers, and trust the Lord for future developments. They accepted the Bible as the inspired Word of God and agreed to recognize the New Testament as their guide, but to accept new light as it came to them. Desiring to enter the covenant relation with Christ, they recognized that they must be baptized as he directed. This they understood to be trine immersion for penitent believers only. There were eight of them with Mack as their leader.

1. Origin in Germany.

The seven desired their leader to baptize them, but, as he believed he had never been baptized aright himself, he declined to baptize others. It was then decided that one, to be selected by lot, should baptize Mack, and he the rest of them, which was done in 1708 in the river Eder. The eight then organized themselves into a society, chose Mack for their preacher, and commenced active work. The services clustering around the Last Supper became their model for the love-feast, hence they observed the rite of foot-washing, followed by an evening meal, and that by the loaf and cup; greeted each other with the kiss of charity; anointed their sick with oil; refused to take oaths or engage in lawsuits; held to the doctrine of non-resistance; became earnest advocates of plain attire; and refrained from attending places of amusement. Because of their claims of conformity to New Testament ideals, their zeal, and their simplicity, many were drawn to their ranks, and in the course of a few years there were hundreds of members, a number of ministers, and several churches in Germany, Holland, and Switzerland, the congregation at Schwarzenau being much the strongest.

Though they were a peaceable and harmless people, persecutions soon arose and scattered and disheartened them, and they began emigrating to America, settling first at Germantown, Pa., where denominational headquarters were established. The first company, headed by Peter Becker, a minister of great piety, came over in 1719. A second and larger company, accompanied by Alexander Mack, landed at Philadelphia in 1729. In the course of a few years the entire membership found its way to the Western world, largely through the instrumentality of William Penn, who offered the persecuted of Europe cheap lands in Pennsylvania, with permission to worship God as their conscience dictated. The first congregation in America was organized at Germantown Dec. 25, 1723, with Peter Becker in charge. Several settlements had already been formed in the vicinity of Germantown and Philadelphia, and some meetings held. Mack visited these communities with a view of promoting harmony, encouraging the Brethren, and confirming them in their faith and practise. John Conrad Beissel, a man of considerable ability and influence, holding mystical views, occasioned much trouble. He became convinced that the seventh day should be observed as the Christian Sabbath, that there should be community of goods, and that the celibate life was most pleasing to the Lord. He secured a considerable following and, notwithstanding Mack's earnest efforts to heal the breach, withdrew with his adherents and established the Ephrata Community (see COMMUNISM, II., 5). Mack died in 1735 and was buried in the Germantown cemetery. The small communities grew into large congregations, and these gave rise to other settlements in Virginia, Maryland, and other parts of Pennsylvania. Christopher Sower (or Saur) established a large printing plant in Germantown, published a weekly paper, printed many books, and brought out the celebrated Sower Bible (see SOWER, CHRISTOPHER); he also aided in establish-

2. Emigration to America.

ing a high-school in Germantown, and printed Sunday-school cards for the use of the Brethren many years before the Sunday-school was introduced in England by Robert Raikes.

During the Revolutionary War the Dunkers lost severely in property and prestige, but soon after the close of the war they again became active, and settlements were formed in Tennessee, North Carolina, Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana, many of which grew into flourishing churches. Until the Civil War they continued to spread, passing into Illinois and west of the Mississippi river. They opposed slavery, were non-resistant, and hence took no part whatever in the conflict between the contending armies, though their sympathies were with the North. When peace was restored the churches on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line again came together and went forward as though there had been no national strife. Emigration resumed its course, and now they have churches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Their first religious paper, the *Gospel Visitor*, a small monthly, was published in 1851. From this small beginning the publishing interest has grown until now the main body of the Church owns and controls a large, finely equipped printing plant at Elgin, Ill. The *Gospel Messenger*, a large religious weekly, is the church organ. There are many other publications, including a paper for young people, a missionary journal, a full supply of Sunday-school literature, and a large printing business is carried on. The profits from these sources are used in missionary work. Educational interests came to the front in the seventies, and there are now a number of educational institutions, extending from Maryland to California, including schools at Huntingdon and Elizabethtown, Pa.; Bridgewater and Daleville, Va.; Union Bridge, Md.; Canton, O.; North Manchester, Ind.; Mt. Morris and Chicago, Ill.; McPherson, Kans.; and Lordsburg, Cal. Foreign mission work commenced in 1876, when a mission in Denmark was opened. There are now churches in Switzerland, France, Sweden, and India. The most extensive foreign work is done in India, where twenty-five American missionaries are in the field The conference of 1906 appointed the first missionaries for China.

3. Development 1783-1882.

From the beginning the society depended upon and encouraged the free ministry system. Mack, Becker, and other early ministers received no compensation for their services. This gave rise to a system well adapted to the opening up of missions and founding of churches by emigration. Of late years many of the congregations are supporting their pastors, especially in the cities. Ministers are elected by the congregations in which they hold their membership, each member being entitled to a vote. The brother receiving the highest number of votes is declared elected and is installed in what is known as the first degree, where he has limited privileges. If he proves faithful and efficient he is advanced to the second degree, his duties and privileges being considerably enlarged. The bishops (or elders, as they are generally called) are chosen from the ministers of the second degree. They are set apart or ordained by the laying on of hands of the elders presiding at this ordination, and placed in charge of the churches as needed. There are also deacons, elected in the same way as ministers, whose duty it is to look after the poor and the sick, to visit the members, and to look after the church finances.

4. The Ministry.

The Dunkers have no formal creed aside from the New Testament, but are aided and unified in their work by the minutes of the Annual Meeting, which has convened since about 1742. To this conference questions involving doctrine, church polity, and methods are brought, and the decisions made are the rule of the churches. This general conference is made up of delegates, lay or clerical, from the local congregations, and bishops from the State districts. The latter compose a standing committee, whose duty it is to select from their own number the officers for the conference. Only regularly ordained elders can serve on the standing committee, and no one can serve two years in succession. The local churches in each State are grouped into one or more State districts, and each district is entitled to one or more elders or bishops on the standing committee, the number being determined by the membership of the district. Church government is democratic. The Annual Meeting settles disputed points, and each member is expected duly to respect and live up to the conference decisions. The Conservative Dunkers make a specialty of plain dressing and avoid places of amusement unbecoming their profession. Their attire is neat, comfortable, and tidy, and there is a general uniformity about their style that renders them easily recognizable. In this respect they resemble the Quakers, and they are the most radical of temperance people.

5. Creed, Government, and Present Condition.

The Conservative Dunkers now number about 100,000, and are increasing rapidly. Their movement began among the common people, and for generations they were found principally in the rural districts, most of them being industrious and thrifty farmers. They have long been noted for their skill and enterprise in establishing and building up ideal rural communities, with the finest moral, religious, and educational environments. Many of their places of worship, which are large and commodious, are in the country. They meet each Lord's Day for Sunday-school and preaching services. Once or twice a year they meet, always in the evening, for their love-feast. On these occasions there is first preaching on self-examination, followed by the service of foot-washing, the men and women occupying separate parts of the building; next, they eat together what they call the Lord's Supper, at the close of which they greet each other with the kiss of charity; then follows the communion of the loaf and cup, unleavened bread being used.

Until 1881–82 the Dunkers were a united people with one conference. For some time, however, there had been a growing desire for more advanced steps along educational and missionary lines. There was a demand for more liberty in dress

and a growing disrespect for the decisions of the Annual Meeting. Two radical parties developed and became separated from the Church; a large majority took middle ground, and remained with the conference. The result was the separate organization of the "Progressive" and "Old Order" Brethren (see below). Since the separation the mother Church has made rapid advance. It retains all of its fundamental doctrinal and moral principles, while opening Sunday-schools, building up colleges, extending and endowing its mission work, and enlarging its publishing interests. The Conservatives and Progressives do not affiliate, but the unpleasant feeling that at first existed has practically subsided.

6. The Division of 1882.

J. H. MOORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are the *Minutes of the Annual Meeting*, 1778–1876, collected into one volume, Elgin, Ill.; *Revised Minutes of the Annual Meeting*, brought down to 1898, ib. For the history consult: Henry Kurtz, *Brethren's Encyclopædia*, Columbiana, O., 1867; M. G. Brumbaugh, *Hist. of the German Baptist Brethren in Europe and America*, Elgin, 1899; G. N. Falkenstein, *Hist. of the German Baptist Brethren Church*, Lancaster, Pa., 1901; H. R. Holsinger, *Hist. of the Tunkers and the Brethren Churches*, Oakland, Cal., 1901 (important for the later period); J. L. Gillin, *The Dunkers. A Sociological Interpretation*, New York, 1906 (gives valuable bibliography). For doctrine consult: A. Mack, Jr., *A Plain View of the Rites and Ordinances of the House of God* a translation of *Kurz und einfältige Vorstellung der äusseren aber doch heiligen Rechten und Ordnungen des Hauses Gottes . . .*, last ed., Mount Morris, Ill., 1888; R. H. Miller, *Doctrine of the Brethren Defended*, Indianapolis, 1876.

II. The Progressive Dunkers: The ultimate and fundamental cause of the secession of those Dunkers commonly known as "Progressive" from the mother Church was the rapid growth and development of the north-central division of the United States. As the country increased in population, and new means of speedy communication with the world, with all that it implies, became available, the former isolation of the Dunkers in the wilderness was destroyed. Traditions and customs of the Church which could be defended neither by the Bible nor reason fell into disfavor, and dissatisfaction grew especially with the dogmatic type of mind characteristic of many of the older and more ignorant. The necessity was felt of bringing the Church as rapidly as possible into line with the knowledge and culture of the times. On the other hand, congregations and individuals isolated from the influences which affected the more advanced communities were controlled by traditional beliefs and usages, and aimed at uniformity on the basis of tradition all the more strenuously because they knew of differences which had grown naturally in widely separated parts of the Church. Thus the social conditions of the United States created two radically different tendencies in the Dunker Church; and by 1880 these tendencies had come into open conflict which resulted in the division.

1. Fundamental Cause of Separation.

The immediate cause of the separation was sympathy with Henry R. Holsinger, of Berlin, Pa., because of what his friends considered ill treatment by the Annual Meeting of 1882. He was a radical "Progressive" and was expelled by the Annual Meeting, charged with speaking and writing disrespectfully of certain leading members of the Church and of the Annual Meeting. Large numbers of his sympathizers in many congregations went out with him, in some places the separation being made by mutual consent, in others the Progressives being expelled. The work of organizing Progressive congregations went on rapidly under a committee appointed for the purpose by a convention at Ashland, O., in 1882. Hope of a reconciliation with the Conservatives was finally dissipated by the failure of the Annual Meeting of 1883 to take steps looking to that end, and the Progressives then formally organized as the Brethren Church at a convention at Dayton, O., in June, 1883, representatives being present from about fifty congregations. In 1887 State organizations were formed and a national Sisters' Society of Christian Endeavor was organized. In 1892 a denominational Young People's Society was formed, which later was affiliated with the Christian Endeavor movement. In 1895 the General Mission Board was organized; it has city missions in Chicago, Philadelphia, and Washington. About 1900 a Foreign Missionary Society was organized, which maintains stations in Montreal, Canada, and Urmia, Persia. Following the Dayton convention the college at Ashland, O., was turned over to the Progressives on condition that they assume its indebtedness. It now has an endowment of about $60,000 and in 1905–06 had an enrolment of 150 students. The publishing house is at Ashland, O. In 1895 there were 138 congregations reported with a membership of 10,031. In 1905 the membership was 14,117 in 144 congregations in eighteen States of the Union. The States having the largest membership are Pennsylvania, 3,357; Indiana, 3,275; Ohio, 2,443; Virginia, 880; and Iowa, 841. The church periodical is the *Brethren Evangelist*.

2. Organization and Present Status.

In doctrine the Progressive Dunkers differ from the Conservatives in but few points. They hold that the decisions of no conference are binding upon the individual conscience. Hence, in church polity the Progressives are congregational. They differ from the Conservatives in refusing to conform to "the order," i.e. the style of dress and cut of the hair and beard prescribed by the Annual Meeting. They agree with the Conservatives in holding the general Evangelical doctrines, and in laying less emphasis upon orthodox theology than upon a pious life. They also hold with the Conservatives the doctrines (1) of the Lord's Supper consisting of foot-washing, the love-feast, or primitive agape, the communion in bread and wine, and the salutation; (2) of baptism for adults only and by trine immersion; (3) of non-resistance of evil, which includes opposition to war and avoidance of lawsuits; and (4) of opposition to the taking of any kind of oath.

3. Doctrine and Practise.

J. L. GILLIN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the works of Holsinger and Gillin, ut sup., the files of *The Progressive Christian*, 1878–83; *The Brethren Evangelist*, 1883–date; *The Breth-*

ren Annual, 1882–date; *Reports of the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting; Classified Minutes*, 1888; and the *Revised Minutes*.

III. The Old Order Brethren: These are the ultraconservatives who oppose all change and refuse to accept new methods. In 1881 they organized a yearly conference meeting in a barn in Montgomery County, O., following old traditions and customs as far as possible, and have continued as a separate society with no affiliations with either of the other bodies. They publish a monthly, the *Vindicator*, at Brookville, O., but have no colleges, high-schools, Sunday-schools, or missionary departments. They have no supported ministers. In dress and other ways they are extremely plain. In doctrine they do not differ materially from the mother Church. For alleged Scriptural reasons they object to being numbered, but are estimated to include about 4,000 members, chiefly in the States of Ohio, Indiana, and Pennsylvania. J. H. Moore.

DUNN, RANSOM: Free-Will Baptist; b. at Bakersfield, Vt., July 7, 1818; d. at Scranton, Pa., Nov. 9, 1900. He was educated at New Hampton, N. H., and in the early part of his life was an Evangelist, chiefly in Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, and Michigan. Later he held a number of pastoral charges, the most important being at Boston and Hillsdale, Mich. He taught at different times in Hillsdale College, where he was president 1885–86 and professor of homiletics and head of the theological department after 1888. He wrote *Freedom of the Will* (Dover, N. H., 1850) and *Systematic Theology* (in collaboration with J. J. Butler; Boston, 1892).

DUNNE, EDWARD JOSEPH: Roman Catholic bishop of Dallas, Tex.; b. at Tipperary, Ireland, Apr. 23, 1848. He was brought by his parents to Chicago in infancy, and studied at the College of St. Mary's of the Lake, Chicago, St. Francis' Seminary, Milwaukee, and St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. In 1871 he was ordained to the priesthood, and after being assistant at two Chicago churches was appointed rector of All Saints' in the same city in 1875. In 1893 he was consecrated second bishop of Dallas.

DUNNING, ALBERT ELIJAH: Congregationalist; b. at Brookfield, Conn., Jan. 5, 1844. He was graduated at Yale College in 1867, and Andover Theological Seminary in 1870. From 1870 until 1880 he was pastor of the Highland Congregational Church, Boston, and was then general secretary of the Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society until 1889, since which time he has been editor in chief of the *Congregationalist*. He was a member of the International Sunday-school Lesson Committee 1884–1902, and its secretary 1897–1902. In 1903 he was elected secretary of the department on Sunday-schools of the Religious Education Association, and was made chairman of the committee on polity for the union of the Congregational, United Brethren, and Methodist Protestant Churches in 1906. He has written *The Sunday-school Library* (Boston, 1883); *Bible Studies* (1888); and *Congregationalists in America* (1894).

DUNS SCOTUS.

His Life (§ 1).
His Philosophy. The Relation of Universals to Particulars (§ 2).
His Epistemology (§ 3).
The Primacy of the Will (§ 4).
Revelation and the Church (§ 5).
Conception of God (§ 6).
Doctrine of Sin (§ 7).
Redemption (§ 8).
The Sacraments (§ 9).
The Importance of Scotus (§ 10).
His Works (§ 11).

Johannes Duns Scotus (known as *Doctor subtilis*) was one of the leading scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages; d. at Cologne Nov. 8, 1308. The date of his birth is unknown; the more probable tradition would place it c. 1265, since the other, assigning him an age of only thirty-four years at death, hardly gives time for the production of such an amount of literary work as we have from him. His birthplace is a matter of controversy. The surname Scotus may indicate either Scotland or Ireland. Cavellus and Waddington assert that he was an Irishman. The best view, however, seems to be that which makes Duns an Englishman. At the end of the Oxford manuscript of his work on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard there is a note asserting in the most positive and detailed way that he was born "in a certain village of Northumberland called Dunstane." He joined the Franciscan order at Newcastle, and became a member of Merton College, Oxford (whose statutes, moreover, allowed the admission of none but those of English birth). Under the direction of William of Ware (or Varron), he laid the foundation of his comprehensive learning. Outside of philosophy, his writings display a wide acquaintance with mathematics and astronomy, no doubt a result of his Oxford training. Here, too, originated his philosophical writings, and probably also the great commentary on the "Sentences," the so-called *Opus Oxoniense*. On Nov. 18, 1304, at the command of the general of his order, he presented himself in Paris for the degree of bachelor, and soon afterward proceeded to that of doctor. Here originated the *Quodlibetica* and the so-called *Reportata Parisiensia*, a smaller commentary on the "Sentences," representing the lectures in dogmatic theology which he delivered in Paris. In 1308 he was transferred to Cologne, where he was received with great honors, and lectured in the Franciscan house there for the few months of life that remained to him. The cause of his death is not known. Some later writers speak of apoplexy; others assert that he was buried alive while unconscious, and give harrowing details which are obviously untrustworthy, as they appeared for the first time two centuries after his death.

1. His Life.

The philosophy of Scotus was concerned especially with two problems—the relation of universals to particulars, and the theory of knowledge. The position of Scotus is for the most part that of a moderate realism as it was maintained by the Arabs and by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas. To him universals are by no means "fictions of the intellect"; otherwise there would be no objective essential unities in the world, but only numerical differences between individuals. There must be something real outside ourselves corresponding to the terms; the universal exists both *in intellectu*

and *in re*. Since all existence is traced back to God, it follows that the archetypes of all things that are have been from eternity in the divine mind. This is true also of matter, which may be understood not only as *ens aut nihil* but also as *esse in potentia*. What, then, is the relation of the universal to the particular? According to Thomas, matter is the principle of individuation. This Scotus denies, even on Thomas's view of matter as negative. For him individuation is the work of an *entitas positiva*, and consists in a unity which resists any further division. Now this unity can not have for its basis anything negative, since no negative can be opposed to a positive. The basis is *aliquod positivum intrinsecum*. The significance of the *hœcceitas* of an object (that which renders the object capable of being designated as "this"), or, as he elsewhere calls it, *unitas signata ut hœc*, or *individuitas*, is that in his view (which here again is opposed to Thomas's) the purpose of nature is realized in the particular. As this purpose is laid down by God, we must, in accordance with the divine ordinance, regard the individual and the particular as a higher form of existence than the universal.

2. His Philosophy. The Relation of Universals to Particulars.

In his epistemology the generally accepted Aristotelian principles naturally predominate. Knowledge is the product of the joint operation of the soul and some *objectum præsens et hoc in specie intelligibili*. Though our knowledge presupposes an impression made on the senses, yet the image they receive does not create the conception; the *species intelligibilis* inherent in the object excites the action of the mind, which appropriates the species by abstraction. In this process of building up a conception the intellect is the "principal cause"; only the "occasion" of its activity is furnished by the external world. The work of the intellect is thus to extract universals from particulars. This is not to be taken as if it were necessary to neglect all concrete sense-perception in order to attain the universal; the general must authenticate itself by the concrete. The view of Scotus is that thought, in the process of constructing terms, perceives in the phenomena of sense the universal which underlies them; and this is in the main the view of the later realists.

3. His Epistemology.

The primacy of the will is a dominant thought in all his philosophy. In both Aristotle and Thomas the will is moved by the intellect, which Thomas thus places higher than the will, believing that happiness is to be attained through it and not through the will. This view is strongly combated by Scotus. All knowledge, according to him, is dependent upon the operation of external things, and man is not free in regard to his thought; as distinguished from the will, thought is natural, and subject to "natural necessity." If, then, thought (or the object which determines the thought) caused the act of the will, an affirmative act of the will would be explicable enough, but not the simultaneous possibility of a negative act, since a "natural agent" can produce only one effect. The will, therefore, must be the sole cause of its decisions. If this were not the case, natural actions would not be free, and there would be no room for merit or demerit as applied to the will.

4. The Primacy of the Will.

This view postulates the possibility of things happening freely and by chance, which is a fact of experience. Scotus does not deny that the intellect cooperates with the will, or that intellectual notions influence every act of the will. He means only that the actual volition is the work of the free will, the intellect playing merely the part of a *causa subserviens*. From this proposition he deduces consequences opposed to the Thomist views. Acts of the will are on a higher plane than acts of the intellect. The fact that it is the will which is attacked by the corruption of sin is an additional demonstration of its primacy; and in like manner happiness is enjoyed primarily not by the understanding but by the will. In a word, the purpose of being is realized by the exercise of free, personal will.

The theology of Scotus presupposes a revelation, which teaches man the aim to be sought by his will and the means of reaching it. These necessary truths are taught by Scripture, whose credibility is demonstrated at length, and contained in summary in the Apostles' Creed, or in the three ancient creeds, and in addition to these in the authority of the "authentic Father" and the "Roman Church." Since the Church has determined the canon, submission to the authority of Scripture involves submission to the Church, which "approves and authorizes" the Scriptural books. The decision of the Roman Church pronounces a doctrine orthodox or heretical. Even when a doctrine has no other authority or rational foundation, it must be accepted on the single authority of the Church. The way is thus paved for the ecclesiastical positivism of later scholasticism. The whole body of positive and practical truths offered by theology is apprehended by faith.

5. Revelation and the Church.

He reaches his conception of God by endeavoring to show, from the standpoints of causality, finality, and *eminentia*, the necessity of an *Ens infinitum*, having no external cause or end and no superior. Considering God as the *primum efficiens* and *per se agens*, he reaches some useful positive conclusions, proving at length that this *primum efficiens* must possess intelligence and will. What God wills, he wills only because he wills it. He does not will the good because it is good, but good is good because he wills it. The absolute power of God has theoretically only one limit, that of the logically impossible; in practise it is limited, in accordance with what he actually has willed or wills, to a *potentia ordinata*. The sum of the relations of God to the world may be designated as love, which embraces the entire creation, present and potential. All creation forms a whole, whose individual parts rank according to their relation to their end of being; and this relation determines the degree of the divine love given to each. As God finds the end of his being in himself, he loves himself first—then men,

6. Conception of God.

in so far as they are in immediate relation to this end.

The sinlessness of man in Paradise was theoretically only potential, since the will includes the possibility of sinning. The real sinlessness of the first man therefore involves a "superadded gift," the imparted supernatural "habit" of grace, by which alone he was able to subject his lower powers to his higher. Since concupiscence, or the opposition of the flesh to the spirit, belongs to the original nature of man, it can not be the basis of original sin, which is rather to be designated as "the lack of original righteousness." Concupiscence is the natural material of original sin, but only becomes sin when the *frenum cohibens* is removed. Scotus is thus led into the denial of the physical transmission of original sin. Just as the will can not bring about a metamorphosis of the natural constitution, so an inherited physical constitution can not change the will. The redemption of man from sin stands for Scotus upon quite another basis. In so far as *justitia originalis* was imparted to Adam and his posterity, it was a *justitia debita;* and the will of each of his descendants has the same debt. Physical generation comes into question only in that by it we are made children of Adam and placed under the ideal obligation to this *justitia.* This doctrine strikes at the root of the Augustinian theory of original sin; it replaces the physical transmission of sinful concupiscence by the ideal obligation of every child of Adam to the supernatural righteousness originally imparted to the first man.

7. Doctrine of Sin.

In his treatment of redemption, Scotus denies that the merits of Christ are infinite. Their basis is in the obedience rendered by him, which is the act of his human will; and as that will is finite, so the merits acquired by its act must be finite. The eternal divine predestination embraces in itself, as the means to its accomplishment, the meritorious Passion of Christ. The death of Christ acquires its unique value in virtue of the divine will which has ordained this means and purposed to accept it as sufficient for the redemption of humanity. Here comes in the question made familiar by Anselm—whether the precise form of the Passion was necessary to redemption; and this question leads Scotus to a criticism of Anselm's theory. He denies the absolute necessity of satisfaction, which was only necessary so far as God willed it, which he was not bound to do. But even if the necessity of satisfaction is admitted, it does not follow that it must be made by God, since it is not true that a satisfaction exceeding in value that of all creation must have been offered. The value of the redeeming act is not in the thing offered, but in its acceptance by the divine will. Christ, seeing the sinfulness of the Jews and their perverted devotion to the Law, desired "to recall them from error by his words and deeds." He taught them the truth, and, in the execution of this task, died for righteousness, considering his Passion the most effective means of winning men back to God through love. So far this doctrine of satisfaction follows in the main the type represented by Abelard. How Scotus conceived the objective side of the Atonement is seen in another passage, where he says that God would not forgive sin unless something was offered to him which pleased him more than sin displeased him; and this could only be the obedience of a person whom he loved more than he would have loved humanity had it not sinned. This was Christ, in return for whose obedience and love God showed mercy to the human race. The imparting of the grace of God is thus the result of the merits of Christ. By the word grace in the ordinary sense of *gratia creata* Scotus understands the divinely-imparted "habit" of love, which inclines the human will to meritorious acts. Grace is "a principle cooperating" with the will. With such cooperation, man would have to be supposed capable of performing meritorious acts *ex solis naturalibus,* which would be a Pelagian assumption. There must be a supernatural form imprinting its character upon human action, without forcing it and thus taking away all merit; and through this "habit" not only the single act but the whole man becomes acceptable to God.

8. Redemption.

Like most medieval theologians, Scotus considered the imparting of grace as inseparably attached to the sacraments, which are given to men in virtue of the Passion of Christ as the "most perfect meritorious cause of grace." Apart from the general questions as to the nature of sacraments, the most interesting thing in his treatment is his discussion of the relation between the divine and earthly factors in the sacraments. Since the grace which is imparted to man by a sacrament can only come into being through a creative act, and creation in that sense is impossible to man, it follows that the gift of grace in the sacrament is the result of the direct operation of God, not of priestly action. On their human or external side, the sacraments are symbolic acts, which typify the accompanying divine operation within the soul. But these symbols are sure and operative, since God has promised to accompany their use with the effect which they symbolize. He thus defines a sacrament as "a symbol cognizable by the senses, efficaciously signifying by divine institution the grace of God or the effect of God's gracious operation, ordained for the salvation of man in this life." There can then be no question of an indwelling of supernatural power in the sacraments; they are not in themselves "causes of grace," but can be so called only because the symbols are secure evidences of the corresponding operations of grace, while God's will is the sole cause of grace, which he creates directly in the soul. This view had already been clearly stated by Bonaventura, and through Scotus it came to dominate the theology of the later Middle Ages.

9. The Sacraments.

The historical importance of the general teaching of Scotus can scarcely be overestimated. He brought the scholastic method to its highest point. His brilliant dialectic, his acuteness of insight, the earnestness of his criticism, and the carefulness of his demonstration set an example which has sel-

dom been equaled by his followers. In his treatment of authority he gave it a different bearing from that which it had had with the older scholastics; it became a positive ecclesiastical law, from which no deviation could be tolerated, and this legal conception of orthodoxy marked out the line in which the later nominalist theology followed. According to his idea of God, all that is must be referred to the absolutely free will of the Creator; and the task of learning is therefore not the working out of what is rationally necessary but the determination of that which is positively ordained by God. This is particularly true of theology, which, embracing a number of contingent dispositions of God, has to deal with a peculiar range of facts. This explains Scotus's feeling for the particular and the individual, as well as the free skeptical spirit in which he approaches tradition. Characterizing God as Will, and finding the essence of man's nature also in his Will he naturally emphasizes the individual and his freedom in his view of humanity. Thus by his sharp criticism of traditional theories and by his bold creation of new terms and combinations, he set forces at work in the domain of theology which did much to prepare the way for the still more thoroughgoing criticism of the Reformers.

10. The Importance of Scotus.

His works are best consulted in the relatively complete edition of his fellow Franciscan Wadding (12 vols., Lyons, 1639), or the new one (26 vols., Paris, 1891-95), which, however, marks no very notable advance over Wadding. The most important is the great commentary on the "Sentences" known as the *Opus Oxoniense* (vols. viii.–xxi. of the Paris edition); of this the *Reportata Parisiensia* (vols. xxii.–xxiv.) is an abridgment. Of the remaining works a large part consists of commentaries on various treatises of Aristotle, including the "Physics," "Metaphysics," "Meteorologics," "Refutations," and "Of the Soul." His logical works of which the *Grammatica Speculativa* is the most important, are also largely based on those of Aristotle and on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry. Others are entitled *Theoremata*, *Disputationes subtilissimæ*, *Conclusiones metaphysicæ* (whose authenticity is questioned by some), and the *Quæstiones quodlibetales* (vols. xxv.–xxvi.). Of the exegetical and homiletical works mentioned by Wadding, no trace has yet been found.

11. His Works.

(R. SEEBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best life is in vol. i. of the edition of the works by Wadding, ut sup. Consult further: J. Müller, *Biographisches über Duns Scotus*, Cologne, 1881; K. Werner, *Johannes Duns Scotus*, Strasburg, 1881; *DNB*, xvi. 216–220. For the philosophy consult: F. C. Baur, *Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung*, vol. ii. passim, Tübingen, 1842; M. Schneid, *Die Körperlehre des Johannes Duns Scotus*, Mainz, 1879; K. Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, vol. i., Vienna, 1881; A. Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, i. 73 sqq., Bonn, 1882; W. Kahl, *Der Primat des Willens bei Augustinus, Duns Scotus und Descartes*, Strasburg, 1886; R. Seeberg, *Die Busslehre des Duns Scotus*, in *Abhandlungen für Alexander von Oettingen*, pp. 172 sqq., Munich, 1897; idem, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. ii. passim, Leipsic, 1898; idem, *Die Theologie des Johannes Duns Scotus*, ib. 1900; A. H. Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, viii. 354 sqq., Hamburg, 1834–53; and the works on the history of philosophy by F. Ueberweg (i. 452–457, New York, 1874), J. E. Erdmann (vol. i. passim, ib. 1890), and W. Windelband (pp. 311–344, 384, 394, 420–423, ib. 1893). An excellent list of works on the subject is furnished in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, iii. 1, pp. 186–187, New York, 1905. The treatment by A. Ritschl is in Eng. transl., *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Edinburgh, 1872.

DUNSTAN, SAINT: Archbishop of Canterbury; b. near Glastonbury (5 m. s. of Wells, Somerset) probably in 925; d. at Canterbury May 19, 988. He was of noble family and related to Elphege of Winchester and other bishops. His early education was received from Irish scholars in the abbey of Glastonbury, but his distinguished birth and rich personal endowments led to his being summoned to the court by King Athelstan while still a lad. Stories of his visions and dreams point to some morbid or abnormal nervous condition. His fondness for heathen poetry and study of incantations was made a ground of accusation against him, and, as a consequence, he suffered physical ill treatment and was driven from the court. His kinsman, Bishop Elphege, received him at Winchester and, after a period of reluctance on Dunstan's part, made him a monk.

He now returned to Glastonbury (942?) and devoted himself to the study of the Bible and the Fathers, finding also occupation and amusement in painting, music, and working in metals. Bells, crosses, and many small articles were long shown in Glastonbury as his workmanship. He is said to have adopted an ascetic life and to have built with his own hands a small cell "more like a grave than a human dwelling-place," which served him as living-room, oratory, and workshop. He was again summoned to the court by King Edmund, only to be again expelled; but the almost miraculous escape of the king from great danger while hunting softened his mind and led to Dunstan's being recalled and made abbot of Glastonbury (c. 946, at the age of twenty-one). The buildings were in a ruinous condition, the true monastic life had died out, lay brothers had taken the place of monks, and the crown had seized upon the rights of patronage and the estates. Dunstan's innovations were rather a new foundation than a reformation. With generous support from the king he built up an institution which was more of a school than a Benedictine community, though his companions wore monk's garb. From it went forth archbishops and clergy of all sorts, who founded and ruled monasteries, disseminated Dunstan's teaching, and instructed the young. Glastonbury became the center of a monastic reform in Britain, which culminated in the complete establishment of the Benedictine rule (though not till after Dunstan's return from Blandigny; see below), carried through by Dunstan himself in milder form, by his followers with more rigor.

After Edmund's murder (946) Dunstan became chief advisor and treasurer of King Edred, who had probably been his playmate at Athelstan's court. The young and physically weak king owed much to Dunstan's wise counsel, and the final suppression of a revolt in Northumbria was largely the work

of the energetic minister. Edred promoted Dunstan's plans for monastic reform and wished to make him bishop of Crediton in Devonshire (953), but Dunstan declined because he had not attained the canonical age and wished to remain by the king. A divine revelation is said to have foretold him of the impending sudden death of his royal friend (955), and he interred the body at Winchester with great honor. Dunstan's enemies prevailed with the new king, Edwy, and he fled to Flanders to the monastery of Blandigny, near Ghent. It was here that he gained his full knowledge of the Benedictine rule. A revolt against Edwy followed in England, Dunstan's friends gained the upper hand, and in 957 he was recalled. The young king, Edgar, made him bishop of Worcester the same year, in 959 also bishop of London, and finally archbishop of Canterbury. He was consecrated Oct. 21, 959, and in 960 received the pallium from Pope John XII. in Rome, where his liberality and piety were much praised. As archbishop he filled his suffragan sees with his adherents, pushed on the monastic reform, and substituted monks for secular clergy, having in all these measures the support of the king and an influential party. It is said that he founded forty new monasteries and filled them in part with French monks. With other bishops he crowned Edgar at Bath in 973, and with wise statecraft he acted as chief minister during Edgar's successful and orderly reign. In the disorders which followed Edgar's death (975), during which the archbishop crowned more than one king, Dunstan's party finally prevailed. In the last years of his life he returned to his early artistic avocations, and took much interest in church building and in education; his old zeal for religion and charity continued unabated. On the whole he presents the picture of a man of piety, himself eager to learn and anxious to teach others, also of an able statesman. Laws of his time, particularly under Edgar, show a strong sense of justice, and church ordinances bear marks of his mild hand. No genuine literary works of Dunstan's are preserved. He was buried in his church, not at Glastonbury, as asserted later. A cycle of legends and wonders soon grew up about his memory. H. Hahn.

Bibliography: Sources for biography are the *Vitæ*, including one by a contemporary priest (signed B), that by Adelard of Ghent (1006–11 A.D.), and one by Osbern (a contemporary of Lanfranc), are collected in *ASB*, May, iv. 346–384, in *MPL*, cxxxvii., cxxxix., clx., and with other documents, ed. W Stubbs, in *Memorials of St. Dunstan, Rolls Series*, No. 63, London, 1874. These are supplemented by the *Dunstan Saga*, ed. G. Vigfusson, Eng. transl. by G. W. Dasent, *Rolls Series*, London, 1887–94. Further sources are indicated in T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the Hist. of Great Britain, Rolls Series*, No. 26, i. 2, pp. 594–609, ib. 1862. As sources consult also: D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ . 446–1717*, 4 vols., London, 1737; *Codex diplomaticus ævi Saxonici*, ed. J. M. Kemble, 6 vols., ib. 1839. For more modern treatment consult: Engelhardt, *Dissertatio de Dunstano*, Erlangen, 1834; W. Robinson, *Life of St. Dunstan*, London, 1844; W F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. i., ib. 1860; *DNB*, xvi. 221–230.

DUNSTER, HENRY: First president of Harvard College; b. probably at Bury (8 m. n.n.w. of Manchester), Lancashire, England, 1609 (said to have been baptized Nov. 26, 1609; cf. *The Nation*, lxxxiv., 1907, p. 9); d. at Scituate, Mass., Feb. 27, 1659. After studying at Magdalene College, Cambridge (B.A., 1630; M.A., 1634), he took orders; in 1640 he came to America to escape High-church tyranny. On Aug. 27 of the same year he was appointed president of Harvard, and held this position till Oct. 24, 1654, when he was forced to resign on account of his antipedobaptist views (see Baptists, II., 1, § 4). He then removed to Scituate, where he was engaged in the ministry till his death. For the public proclamation regarding infant baptism, which had caused his retirement from Harvard, he was indicted by the grand jury and sentenced to a public admonition; and later he was presented to this body for failure to baptize one of his children. He did much to give standing to Harvard, and was greatly esteemed for his piety and learning. He had a good knowledge of Hebrew, and when Eliot, Welde, and Mather prepared the "Bay Psalm Book" (q.v.) they submitted the work to him for revision.

Bibliography: J. Chaplin, *Life of Henry Dunster*, Boston, 1872; the histories of Harvard by B. Pierce, Cambridge, 1833, J. Quincy, Boston, 1840, and S. A. Eliot, ib. 1848; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 125–126, New York, 1859; *DNB*, xvi. 231–232.

DUPANLOUP, dü″pāṅ″lū′, **FÉLIX ANTOINE PHILIBERT:** French prelate; b. at St. Félix, 14 m. n.n.e. of Chambéry, Jan. 3, 1802; d. at the Château Lacombe, near Grenoble, Oct. 11, 1878. He was ordained priest at Paris in 1825. In 1841 he received a professorship at the Sorbonne, in 1849 the bishopric of Orléans, and in 1854 he became a member of the French Academy. As a writer and speaker he was untiring in his efforts in behalf of the Roman Catholic Church and clergy. He belonged to a liberal group, opposing the dogma of papal infallibility, but submitted to the decision of the Vatican Council in 1870. In 1871 he was a deputy to the National Assembly, where he allied himself with the clerical right, and in 1875 he was elected a life-senator. He aided in Broglie's attempt at a clerical reaction in 1877, establishing a paper, *La Défense*, in the interest of the movement. Among his numerous writings may be mentioned: *Manuel des catéchismes* (Paris, 1832); *De l'éducation* (3 vols., 1850–62); *Œuvres choisies* (4 vols., 1861); *De la haute éducation intellectuelle* (3 vols., 1870).

Bibliography: F. Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup*, 3 vols., Paris, 1883–84, Eng. transl., 2 vols.. London, 1885; F. A. P de Falloux, *L'Évêque d'Orléans*, Paris, 1879; J. Pougeois, *Mgr. Dupanloup, sa vie publique et privée, ses œuvres*, ib. 1879; C. Hartwig, *Die Erziehungsprinzipien Dupanloups*, Leipsic, 1884

DU PERRON, dü pā″rōṅ′ **(DUPERRON), JACQUES DAVY:** French cardinal and author; b. near Bern Nov. 25, 1556; d. at Batignolles (now part of Paris) Sept. 5, 1618. He was the son of Reformed parents, and received a careful education from his father. Presented at the French court at an early age, he gained the favor of Henry III., and in his twenty-fifth year took orders in the Roman Catholic Church. He was an important factor in the conversion of Henry IV., who appointed him Bishop of Evreux in 1591, and it was he who, together with Cardinal d'Ossat, sought and obtained absolution for the king at Rome in

1595. At this same time the pope consecrated him to his bishopric, and he thereupon devoted himself to the conversion of the Reformed. In 1604 Du Perron became cardinal, and two years later was made Grand Almoner of France and archbishop of Sens. In 1604 he was invited by Clement VIII. to take part in the conferences of the *Congregatio de auxiliis* on Molinism, and he also labored for the reconciliation of the pope and the republic of Venice. He became still more prominent at the Synod of Paris in 1612, which condemned the *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* of Edmond Richer, and at the assembly of the Estates at Paris in 1614–15, where he vainly sought to secure the acceptance of the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent. His writings were published at Paris in 1620–22 in three folio volumes, the first containing his *Traité sur l'eucharistie*, directed primarily against Du Plessis-Mornay; the second comprising his controversy with James I. of England, who had asserted that the Anglican Church formed part of the Church Catholic; and the third including briefer controversial works and the articles drawn up for the conversion of the sister of Henry IV. (C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Feret, *Le Cardinal Du Perron*, Paris, 1877; *Perroniana*, Geneva, 1667.

DU PIN, dü pan' (**DUPIN**), **LOUIS ELLIES**: French Roman Catholic priest and historian; b. at Paris June 17, 1657; d. there June 6, 1719. He was a scion of a noble Norman family, and received a thorough education, becoming a doctor of the Sorbonne in 1684. Two years later appeared the first volume of his chief work, the *Bibliothèque universelle des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, which brought its author into conflict with the clergy and especially with Bossuet on account of its rationalistic tone. Under the threat of a rigid censorship he retracted his views, but could not save his book from suppression by the Parliament of 1683. It was continued, however, under the new title *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, and in this form reached, with the supplements, sixty-one octavo volumes (original ed., 58 vols., Paris, 1686–1704; Eng. transl. by W. Wotton, 17 vols., London, 1693–1707). Involved in the controversy over the bull *Unigenitus* and accused of being a Jansenist and a signer of the "Case of Conscience," he was banished to Chatellerault, and although he was permitted to return after a second retraction, he was not allowed to resume his activity as a teacher at the Collège de France. During the regency he corresponded with William Wake, the archbishop of Canterbury, on the union of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, and all his papers were accordingly confiscated in Feb., 1719, at the order of Dubois. He likewise took part in the attempt to unite the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches made when Peter the Great visited Paris in 1717.

As a Gallican canonist Du Pin wrote his *De antiqua ecclesiæ disciplina dissertationes historicæ* (Paris, 1686) and his *Traité de la puissance ecclésiastique et temporelle* (1707), the latter a detailed commentary on the four theses of the Gallican clergy. Among his numerous other works special mention may be made of the following: *Dissertation préliminaire, ou prolégomènes sur la Bible* (2 vols., 1699; Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1699–1700); *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens* (Amsterdam, 1708; Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1709); *Histoire de l'église en abrégé* (Paris, 1712; Eng. transl., 4 vols., London, 1715–16); *Méthode pour étudier la théologie* (1716; Eng. transl., London, 1720); and his editions of Optatus (Paris, 1700) and of the writings of Johann Gerson (1703). He wrote with extraordinary ease, skill, and taste, but was lacking in depth. (C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Du Pin's notes upon his life and writings are in the *Nouvelle bibliothèque*, xix. 176–253. Consult: Nicéron, *Mémoires*, ii. 25–28; L. G. Michaud, *Biographie universelle*, vol. xii., 45 vols., Paris, 1843–65.

DU PLESSIS-MORNAY, dü''ples''sî'-môr''nê', **PHILIPPE.**

Early Life and Education (§ 1).
First Public Services, 1569–77 (§ 2).
Enters Service of Henry of Navarre (§ 3).
Defense of Henry's Claim to the Succession (§ 4).
Activities as Governor of Saumur (§ 5).
His Great Polemic (§ 6).
His Influence and Importance (§ 7).

Philippe Du Plessis-Mornay (called also Philippe de Mornay, Seigneur du Plessis-Marly, Baron of La Forêt-sur-Sèvre), French Protestant statesman, soldier, theologian, and controversialist; b. at Buhy (Normandy) Nov. 5, 1549; d. at La Forêt-sur-Sévre (Poitou) Nov. 11, 1623. He was destined for the priesthood, and at an early age was sent to the Roman Catholic college of Lisieux at Paris in spite of the fact that his mother had been won over to the practise, though not to the public acknowledgment, of the Reformed faith. In 1559 the father died, a convert to Protestantism, which was now openly professed by the widow and her children. Mornay prosecuted his studies at Paris for a number of years, then, on the outbreak of the second war of religion in 1567, he made ready to join the Huguenot forces under Condé, but was prevented from carrying out his intention by a fall from his horse. A poem on the horrors of civil strife, composed at this time and addressed to the Cardinal of Chatillon, gained him the friendship of that prelate, at whose advice he undertook in 1568 a long journey abroad for the purpose of completing his education under the best foreign teachers. Through Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and England he traveled, devoting his time with characteristic seriousness of purpose to linguistic and juridical studies, acquainting himself with political, ecclesiastical, and social life and the great men of the different countries, and preserving the results of his observations in a carefully kept diary.

1. Early Life and Education.

At Cologne he came into contact with Dutch refugees, whose accounts of Alva's rule stirred the ardent young Protestant to vehement hatred against Roman Catholic Spain and convinced him of the unity of interests between the adherents of the Reformed faith in France and Holland. Two pamphlets addressed to the Dutch people, exhorting them to cast off the Spanish yoke, gained him the attention and friendship of William the Silent. Co-

ligny, too, discerned the splendid promise of his talents, and a memorial composed by Du Plessis, urging the expediency of rendering aid to the Dutch provinces, was laid by the great admiral before Charles IX. He narrowly escaped the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and with great difficulty made his way to England, where he remained till the end of 1573, acting for a time as the agent of William the Silent and the Duke of Alençon and Anjou. Summoned by La Noue to France, he took part in the unsuccessful Huguenot attempt at Saint Germain in Mar., 1574, was defeated at Nantes, went on a diplomatic mission to Louis of Nassau, and was taken prisoner in the battle of Dormans in Oct., 1575, but escaped recognition and, ransomed for a small sum, took up his residence at Sédan. There he made the acquaintance of Charlotte Arbaleste, a young widow of deeply pious character and an ardent Huguenot, whom he married in Jan., 1576. It was characteristic of her that she requested a literary dissertation as a marriage gift, and Du Plessis accordingly composed his *Discours de la vie et de la mort* (Lausanne, 1576; Eng. transl. *Discourse of Life and Death*, by Edward Aggas, London, 1577, six later editions).

2. First Public Services, 1569–77.

In the sixth civil war, which broke out in 1577, Du Plessis took little share. La Noue had presented him to Henry of Navarre, who sent him on a mission to England, where he remained for more than a year, composing his *Traité de l'église* London, 1578; Eng. transl. *A Treatise of the Church*, by I. Feilde, 1579, 2d ed., 1581). From 1578 to 1582, with the exception of a brief sojourn in England, he represented the interests of Henry of Navarre in the Netherlands, residing at Antwerp, and, after 1580 at Ghent. In the latter city he completed an ambitious theological work, the *Traité de la verité de la religion chrétienne contre les Athées, Epicuriens, Payens, Juifs, Mahumedistes, et autres Infideles* (Antwerp, 1581; Eng. transl. *A Worke Concerning the Trewnesse of the Christian Religion*, by Sir Philip Sidney and A. Golding, London, 1587, 4th ed., 1617). In 1582 he was recalled to France by the king of Navarre, and from that time dates the friendship between the two that was to last until Henry's conversion to Roman Catholicism. With consummate energy and fine literary talents he became Henry's mouthpiece and public defender. He was his most trusted counselor and a fearless, though respectful, critic where he believed the prince untrue to himself. His presence at court was felt in a general chastening of manners, and a monument of his peculiar part in this friendship was the remarkable essay, *Règlement de la façon de vivre*, composed for the king in Jan., 1583. In the differences existing between the heads of the Huguenot party and Henry of Navarre, Du Plessis acted as a mediator. At the Synod of Vitré in May, 1583, suspicion of Henry's ambitions was rife among the delegates, whose views were largely tinged with the spirit of Calvinistic democracy; Du Plessis was instrumental in bringing about the agreement that a number of deputies of the synod should be assigned to the presence of the prince to be consulted on all ecclesiastical affairs. The project of a union of the Protestant churches of Europe which received some discussion at the same synod was very close to his heart, and at the synods of Gap in 1603, La Rochelle in 1607, and Tonneins in 1614 he was an ardent advocate of the scheme, although he achieved not the slightest success.

3. Enters Service of Henry of Navarre.

The death of the Duke of Anjou in June, 1584, brought Henry of Navarre next in succession to the throne, and the health of the childless Henry III. was such as to make his death at any moment a probable event. By the mass of the French nation the accession of a Protestant king was regarded as out of the question, and the League, in alliance with Spain, entered on a period of renewed activity. In the war of pamphlets that ensued, Du Plessis naturally appeared as the most prominent defender of the legitimate claims of Henry of Navarre. With untiring energy he poured forth a succession of state documents, letters, instructions, and formal argumentations, all expressive of devoted faith in a prince to whom he looked as the coming disseminator of Evangelistic teaching throughout the world. In the war of the Three Henrys which followed the Edict of Nemours in 1585, Du Plessis acted as governor of the important fortress of Montauban and took part in the battle of Coutras (Oct. 20, 1587), Henry's first great victory, and in the unsuccessful siege of Saint-Nazaire. At the political assembly of the Huguenots at La Rochelle in 1588, he exercised his accustomed function of mediator between Henry and the Protestant leaders, and was elected president of the council entrusted with the management of the affairs of the party and its representation at court. The assassination of the Guises at Blois in December of the same year led to a temporary alliance between Henry III. and the king of Navarre against the League, negotiated by Du Plessis, who received the command of the important city of Saumur, which had been assigned as a stronghold to the Huguenots. He fought by the side of Henry of Navarre at Ivry (March 14, 1590) and was present at the siege of Rouen, in the course of which he made a journey to England to solicit the aid of Elizabeth.

4. Defense of Henry's Claim to the Succession.

The resistance of the League had convinced Henry of Navarre that the crown of France was not to be gained so long as he remained a Protestant, and the problem became one merely of rendering his change of religion as little odious as possible. In the negotiations that preceded the king's abjuration of the Huguenot faith Du Plessis appears as the victim of Henry's double dealing. Fond as he was of theological disputation, he felt convinced that an open debate on the rival merits of the warring confessions, could not but serve to strengthen the king in his hereditary faith, and in this spirit of confidence he negotiated with the representative of the League a treaty by which Henry agreed to place himself under Roman Catholic instruction in order to test the truth of the

doctrines of the Church. Too late Du Plessis discovered that his project of a public disputation was not to be realized and that Henry had used him for his own ends. The old friendship between the two was thereby destroyed, and though Du Plessis remained in Henry's service and was concerned in many important affairs of state, he was no longer the spokesman of the king. The loss of royal favor, however, brought no end to the active career of Du Plessis. As governor of Saumur he devoted himself to the strengthening of the fortress and the improvement of the surrounding district. With his own means he founded in 1593 the Protestant university of Saumur, which, till its suppression by Louis XIV. in 1685, was the most important and influential of Protestant theological schools in France. As arbitrator between the Huguenots and the king, he was an especially important figure during the years preceding the promulgation of the edict of Nantes, when the favor shown by Henry IV. to the great Roman Catholic nobles roused among the Huguenots fear of the resumption of persecution. At the assembly of Nantes in 1593 the first steps toward the Edict of Nantes were taken in the formulation of the Huguenot demands. Of greater importance was the Synod of Sainte Foy in the following year, where the organization of the Huguenot party was carried out in accordance with the plans formulated by Du Plessis. Although he took no share in the negotiations leading up to the Edict of Nantes or in the drafting of that document, its provisions must be regarded as largely the result of his long activity in the councils of the king. As the most prominent among Protestant statesmen and theologians Du Plessis received at this time the nickname of the Huguenot Pope.

5. Activities as Governor of Saumur.

In July, 1598, Du Plessis published at La Rochelle *De l'institution, usage et doctrine du saint sacrement dé l'eucharistie en l'église ancienne* (Eng. transl., *The Institution, Usage, and Doctrine of the Holy Sacrament*, London, 1600), a work representing many years of labor and comprising in addition to the main attack on the mass, a polemic against other Roman Catholic doctrines. Over 5,000 quotations from the Scriptures, the Church Fathers, and the medieval theologians constituted a formidable array of evidence and bore testimony to the learning of its author. It was regarded not only as a monumental apology for the Reformed faith, but as the reply of the Protestants to the king's conversion. The Roman Curia and the Sorbonne expressed their condemnation of the work and many rejoinders were published. In 1600 Davy Duperron, bishop of Evreux, formulated the charge against Du Plessis that a large proportion of the citations adduced by him were either entirely false or incorrectly quoted. Du Plessis thereupon challenged his critic to a public disputation which occurred in the presence of the king and his court at Fontainebleau on May 4, 1600. Du Plessis, as a matter of fact, had not made use of the best editions in compiling his references and was, moreover, unequal in theological learning and dialectic to his opponent; but what principally led to the latter's triumph was the disingenuous action of the authorities in allowing Du Plessis a single night for the preparation of his side of the case. Deeply humiliated by the result of the disputation, Du Plessis retired to Saumur, where he busied himself with the recasting of his work, which, sanctioned by a general synod, appeared in a second edition at Saumur in 1604.

6. His Great Polemic.

The death of his only son in 1605 and that of his wife in the following year were severe blows, although they did not draw him away from the sphere of active church politics. After the assassination of Henry IV. (1610), he persevered in his attitude of loyalty to the royal house notwithstanding the machinations of the regent Mary de' Medici against the Huguenots. His influence was still exerted for peace, and when Condé took up arms in 1615, he was successful in restraining the majority of the Protestants from resorting to violence. The court showed little gratitude. On the outbreak of the religious war of 1621 Du Plessis, in spite of his well-known pacific attitude, was deprived of his governorship of Saumur. Wounded in spirit and half-blind, he retired to his castle of La Forêt-sur-Sèvre where he died two years later. His principal works, in addition to those mentioned above, were as follows: *Lacrimæ* (Paris, 1606; Eng. transl. by J. Healey, London, 1609), a threnody on the death of his son; *Le mystère d'iniquité, c'est à dire, l'histoire de la papauté* (Saumur, 1611; Eng. transl., *The Mysterie of Iniquitie that is Historie of the Papacie*, by S. Lennard, London, 1612); and *Discours et méditations chrêtiennes* (3 vols., Saumur and La Forêt, 1609–24). His religious writings show no original contributions in the field of theology; he was too much the polemist to be the pioneer. His importance rests rather in the multifarious activities of his eventful life and in the high example he set of unselfish and steadfast devotion to a cause of the merits of which he was thoroughly convinced. (THEODOR SCHOTT†.)

7. His Influence and Importance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Sources are: D. Licques, *Histoire de la vie de Philippe de Mornay*, Leyden, 1647; *Mémoires et correspondance . de la Fontenelle*, vols. i.–xii., Paris, 1824–25; earlier collections of *Mémoires* appeared at La Forêt, 1624–52, and Amsterdam, 1652–1653; a complete collection of the letters is a desideratum. The best account of the life is in E. Stähelin, *Der Uebertritt . . . Heinrich's IV . zur katholischen Kirche*, Basel, 1856; for English readers, H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, New York, 1886, is very valuable and is detailed. Consult also: G. de Félice, *Hist. de protestants de France*, Paris, 1850; E. and É. Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. vii. ib. 1857; P. de Félice, *Les Protestants d'autrefois*, 4 vols., Paris, 1897–1902. His literary activity is well characterized in A. Savous, *Études littéraires sur les écrivains de la Reformation*, vol. ii., Paris, 1841.

DURAND, dü-rand', OF SAINT POURÇAIN, pūr san.

His Life (§ 1).
Independence as a Thinker (§ 2).
Philosophical Position (§ 3).
His Theology (§ 4).
His Doctrine of the Sacraments (§ 5).
His Significance as a Teacher (§ 6).

Durand of Saint Pourçain (*Durandus de Sancto Porciano*), scholastic theologian, bishop of Meaux, was born at Saint Pourçain (85 m. n.w. of Lyons) in

Auvergne, in the third quarter of the thirteenth century; d. at Meaux (28 m. e. of Paris) Sept. 10, 1334. He entered the Dominican order as early as 1303. In 1312 he was made a licentiate and was called to Avignon as *lector curiæ* and *magister S. Palatii*, and remained there for some time. In

1. His Life. 1317 he was made a bishop, in 1326 bishop of Meaux. During the last years of his life he was in opposition to John XXII. on account of his teaching of the *visio beatifica*, and a *judicium magistrorum theologiæ in curia existentium* declared eleven of his articles objectionable. Of his writings one only has importance, the comprehensive commentary on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard, which he commenced, according to his own statement, while a young man and finished in his old age.

In the controversy between the scientific tendencies of his time, Durand occupied an independent critical position and adhered to no school-authority, a position for which he obtained the name of *Doctor resolutissimus*. To be sure, dogmatic statements which had become authoritative in the Church are without question authoritative for him, but he distinguishes clearly between that which is really an ecclesiastical statement and that which is commonly deduced from it,

2. Independence as a Thinker. the former, not the latter, being binding. Besides, the authority of any individual teacher must yield to good contrary reasons. Especially is this true (as he states with unmistakable reference to the colleagues of Thomas, who would make him the absolutely authoritative theologian of the order, *Præf. in sent.* no. 12) with respect to every modern teacher, for "every one who dismisses reason for the sake of human authority falls into beastly unwisdom." Still more decided is Durand's position against extra-ecclesiastical authorities; "it is no part of natural philosophy to know what Aristotle or other philosophers thought, but the truth of the matter is the essential thing; wherefore when Aristotle deviates from the truth of the matter it is no science to know what Aristotle thought, but rather error" (*Præf. in sent.*, qu. 1, no. 6).

Like all theologians of that time, Durand has his say on the question of *universalia*. But his position is not clear owing to the fact that the commentary was composed during a long period, within which his views underwent development. Hence Prantl states (p. 292) only that he approaches to nominalistic views and Baur (*Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, p. 377), that the premises of nominalism are found in him. Nevertheless every real entity is to him merely individual entity (II., dist. 3, qu. 3, no. 9). To be sure the general concepts are not merely nothings, since they designate congruities which are found among different things, but these congruities do not go back to something really common, therefore: "The unity of a universal in its particulars is not a unity of the thing but a unity of relationship, just as the entity is an entity of relationship" (I., dist. 19, qu. 4, no. 10; cf. II., dist. 3, qu. 3, no. 16). On this account also the much disputed question concerning the *principium individuationis* becomes to him null and void, because he thinks it a simple matter of fact that every thing real proceeds as such

3. Philosophical Position. from the individual and is individual (II., dist 3, qu. 3, no. 15). From this point of view Durand must be considered a nominalist, though this is not clear everywhere. But on the other hand it can not be said that the theological views of Durand are to be traced to his nominalism, or even to his philosophical views in general, for he does not do it himself. Only a certain corresponding tendency in his thinking on both spheres may be admitted. Durand allows his views to develop everywhere from a criticism of his predecessors, but this criticism, acute as it is, rests so little on firm pervading principles that a Durandian system can hardly be spoken of. As a Dominican he started in the first place from Thomas, but in essential points he freed himself from Thomism and pursued in many directions a like path to Scotus, without therefore becoming a Scotist. For example he does not share with him the fundamentally important position of the will before intelligence. On the question whether theology is to be considered a science, he deviates much from Thomas asserting with emphasis that for most theological statements a scientific demonstration is impossible; he does not even admit with Scotus the possibility of a scientifically satisfactory refutation of the contrary reasons (IV., dist. 11, qu. 1, no. 6). Further considerations lead him to the result that theology is in no respect a science in the strict sense, but only in the wider sense, because one may call science a discipline which rests on true propositions, though not evident to the reasoner. On the whole in Durand may be perceived a keen apprehension of the distinction between faith and knowledge. Thomas imagined that he was able to bridge over the chasm between both, since faith, so far as it rests on divine authority appeared to him under the point of view of knowledge, and indeed of a knowledge the certainty of which is greater than that of all knowledge from natural reason (*Summa*, p. I., qu. 1, art. 8, ad. 2). Durand, however, says (II., dist. 23, qu. 7, no. 10) "there are many conditions of knowledge and action in us more certain and better known than faith."

Characteristic of Durand's morally serious but religiously cool mode of consideration is his answer to the question (IV., dist. 1, qu. 7) "whether sin should be more hateful to the believer because it is offensive to God or because it is hurtful to himself." The idea of *offensa Dei*, also that of the wrath of God, is here in substance wholly removed: both are asserted of God only *secundum effectum*, not *secundum affectum*, and by *offensa Dei* must not be understood a displeasure of God in the sinner or the will to punish him, for the expression is nothing more than a metaphorical designation of punishment itself, and originated by transferring to God a disposition analogous

4. His Theology. to that in which the reproving man generally is. The guilt of the sinner is therefore not in the *offensa Dei*, but in the irregular conduct of man; such a conduct is against reason,

whereas the just punishment is not against reason, and hence sin is a greater evil and must be hated more than punishment. This is a way of viewing things which comes near to that of Kant, but is just as far removed from that of Anselm as from that of Luther. No less removed from Anselm is Durand also with respect to the necessity of redemption through the satisfaction by the son of God. If Thomas allowed it at least relatively, Durand denies in the first place all necessity for God to redeem the fallen race, secondly also, if a redemption was to take place, the necessity of a perfect satisfaction, since God could have refused all satisfaction or could have been satisfied with a lesser one (III., dist. 20, qu. 12). That not all have part in the salvation, and that there exists a difference between the predestined and non-predestined, must be assumed on the ground of revelation. For a rational argument one may assert with Thomas that in this way in the order of the universe not only the *bonum misericordiæ* but also the *bonum justitiæ punientis* is fully asserted, but Durand finds this reason not cogent because the punitive justice is only a relative good, in so far as it serves as remedy, for "the universe were better off without guilt and punitive justice than with them; just as nature were better off without sickness and medicine than with them" (I., dist. 41, qu. 2, no. 13).

Concerning the sacraments Durand adopted the already customary number seven, but he went back again to the more ancient distinction between sacraments in the narrower and wider sense and considered marriage as a sacrament only in the wider sense. The doctrine of transubstantiation caused him, like many of his contemporaries, great difficulties. His older contemporary and monastic colleague, John of Paris, taught a kind of consubstantiation—the substances remain after the consecration but not in *proprio supposito*—

5. His Doctrine of the Sacraments.

he was tried on that account but died at Avignon before the trial was ended. Durand is more cautious; he remarks indeed that the reasons for the doctrine are not satisfying, but he also states that the assumption that the substance of the elements remains would remove many difficulties (IV., dist. 11, qu. 1, no. 15–17). Against all these considerations however stands the authority of the Church, to which one must be subject. He wishes therefore only to oppose a certain form of transubstantiation—the common one—according to which a complete change of the substances takes place, and tries to explain this as conceivable by assuming a change of the form of the elements, whereas the substance turns into the form of the body of Christ.

Taking all together the importance of Durand may thus be expressed: (1) he is a theologian of a strictly ecclesiastico-conservative tendency, and only within these limits of one com-

6. His Significance as a Teacher.

paratively more liberal (2) a somewhat larger freedom was made possible for him by the separation of the domains of faith and knowledge, but even in this form he used it in a very moderate manner. (3) His talent is predominantly critical, not productive; he is stronger in critical reflection on the points under discussion than in the deeper apprehension of the subjects; (4) the preceding considerations taken together explain why he was unable to produce an epoch-making impression. Such could have proceeded mainly from the treatment of the preliminary questions of theology and from his nominalism, but in both respects he was outstripped by the boldness of Occam and, as it were, placed in the shade. (5) Nevertheless his main work has for a long time enjoyed an authority on account of the excellences mentioned above and on account of its dogmatic correctness. Gerson recommended him beside Thomas, Bonaventura, and Henry of Ghent, and in the sixteenth century there still existed at Salamanca a special chair for Durand.

S. M. Deutsch.

Bibliography: The commentary on Peter Lombard has been often printed; the Antwerp edition of 1567 is quoted above. O. Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, ad. an. 1534, Cologne, 1694–1727; C. E. du Boulay, *Historia universitatis Parisiensis*, iv. 954, 6 vols., Paris, 1665–73; C. Oudin, *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiæ*, vol. iii., Frankfort, 1722; A. H. Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, viii. 550 sqq., Hamburg, 1845; idem, *Die christliche Philosophie*, i. 712 sqq., Göttingen, 1858; A. Stöckl, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ii. 976–986, Mainz, 1865; J. B. Hauréau, *De la philosophie scolastique*, ii. 411 sqq., Paris, 1850; idem, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, ii. 2, pp. 47 sqq., ib. 1880; C. von Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, iii. 292 sqq., Leipsic, 1867; K. Werner, *Thomas von Aquino*, iii. 106 sqq., Regensburg, 1859; idem, *Die nominalisierende Psychologie des späteren Mittelalters*, Vienna, 1882; idem, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, vol. ii., ib. 1883; J. E. Erdmann, *Hist. of Philosophy*, vol. i., London, 1889; C. Bäumker, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, 3 vols., Münster, 1891–1901.

DURAND OF TROARN: Roman Catholic abbot of Troarn; b. at Neubourg (13 m. n.w. of Evreux) apparently in the early part of the eleventh century; d. at Troarn (5 m. e. of Caen) Feb. 11, 1088. He entered a monastery in early youth, and in 1059 was appointed abbot of Troarn, an office which he held for the remainder of his life. He is noteworthy for his share in the second eucharistic controversy, his *De corpore et sanguine Christi* dating apparently from about 1054. In his opinion the entire controversy centered about the question whether in the Sacrament there was a symbol or a true substance, he himself maintaining the latter teaching as the belief of the entire Catholic Church. His book is noteworthy, as showing the feeling that the attacks of Berengar on the doctrines of Paschasius Radbertus imperiled the truth of Christianity, and as indicating the opposition of the older traditionalistic theologians to any explanation of controverted problems. In conformity with his theory that all difficulties may be solved by the statements of the Church Fathers, a large portion of his work consists of compilations from such predecessors as Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Cassiodorus, Bede, Amalarius, Hincmar, and Fulbert. Noteworthy also are his data concerning the course of the Berengarian controversy from 1050 to 1054.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: The work of Durand is appended to L. d'Achery's edition of Lanfranc, Paris, 1745, and in *MPL*, cxlix. Consult: *Hist. littéraire de France*, viii. 239; H. Sudendorf, *Berengarius Turonensis*, pp. 25 sqq., Gotha,

1850; C. Werner, *Gerbert von Aurillac*, pp. 171 sqq., Vienna, 1878; J. Schnitzer, *Berengar von Tours*, pp. 328 sqq., Stuttgart, 1892.

DURANDUS, GULIELMUS: French canonists. **1.** Called "Speculator" after his chief work; b. at Puimisson, near Béziers, 1237; d. in Rome Nov. 1, 1296. Clement IV made him his auditor-general, subdeacon, and chaplain; Gregory X., his secretary at the council of Lyons (1274); Nicholas III. sent him into the Romagna and to Bologna to receive their homage in his name (1278); Martin IV. made him spiritual legate in the Romagna (1281), and in 1283 rector-general. In 1286 he became bishop of Mende, southern France. His chief book was the *Speculum iudiciale* [Rome, 1474; latest ed., Frankfort, 1668]. Another useful book was his *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, Augsburg, 1470 (Eng. transl. of the first book, *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments*, London, 1906).

2. His nephew succeeded him as bishop of Mendes, Dec. 18, 1296; d. there 1331. His book, *De modo celebrandi concilii et corruptelis in ecclesia reformandis* (in *Tractatus illustrium Juris consultorum*, XIII., I. 159 sqq., Venice, 1584), made quite a sensation in the Middle Ages.

Bibliography: J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, ii. 155–156, Stuttgart, 1877; *KL*, iv. 45–46; and preface to the Eng. transl. of the *Rationale*, 1906.

DURBIN, JOHN PRICE: Methodist Episcopal clergyman; b. near Paris, Bourbon Co., Ky., Oct. 10, 1800; d. in New York Oct. 19, 1876. In 1818 he became an itinerant minister, and later studied at Miami University and Cincinnati College. In 1833 he edited the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, New York. From 1834 to 1845 he was president of Dickinson College, Penn., and from 1850 to 1872 was secretary of the Methodist Missionary Society. He was an eloquent minister and an excellent administrative officer. His principal works were *Observations in Europe* (2 vols., New York, 1844), and *Observations in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor* (2 vols., 1845).

Bibliography: J. A. Roche, *Life of John Price Durbin*, New York, 1889.

DURHAM: A town of northern England (60 m. n.n.e. of York), the seat of an important bishopric of the Church of England. The ecclesiastical foundation there dates from the end of the tenth century, when the monks who were transporting the body of St. Cuthbert (q.v.) to protect it from Danish invaders chose this spot for a permanent abiding-place and built the first church. After the Norman Conquest Benedictine monks were placed in charge of the shrine, and William I. gave Walcher, the bishop, the temporal power of an Earl of Northumberland. Speaking of the palatine jurisdiction which the bishops of Durham enjoyed without limitation until the reign of Henry VIII., Freeman says that thus "the prelate of Durham became one, and the most important, of the only two English prelates whose worldly franchises invested them with some faint shadow of the sovereign powers enjoyed by the princely churchmen of the Empire." The other prelate referred to is the bishop of Ely (see Ely), who owed his power and influence to the location of his see among the fens of East England, as the bishop of Durham owed his to the position of his castle and cathedral on the top of a lofty rock,—an almost impregnable natural fortress. Walcher's successor, William of St. Calais, began the construction of the present stately cathedral, the interior of which is regarded as the noblest piece of Norman architecture extant. In 1827 the supposed tomb of St. Cuthbert was opened and the skeleton found there was identified as actually that of the saint. The remains of the Venerable Bede also repose within the cathedral. Among other names associated with Durham is that of Richard de Bury (q.v.), the most learned man of his generation north of the Alps. Cardinal Wolsey lived here during his tenure of the archbishopric of York, and it was his quarrel with Henry VIII. that resulted in the palatinate beginning to lose its power. Among later bishops, the most distinguished names are those of Joseph Butler, author of the *Analogy*, and the last two, J. B. Lightfoot and B. F. Westcott. The bishops no longer live in the castle, which is now the seat of Durham University, founded in 1833, corresponding to the "Northern University" projected in Cromwell's time, but at Bishop's Thorpe. The bishopric was long one of the richest in England, but on the death of Bishop Van Mildert in 1836 the revenue was reduced to £8,000 (now £7,000) a year, the surplus being devoted to the augmentation of a fund for increasing the revenues of the poorer bishops. Although the last vestiges of the palatine authority disappeared at this time, the bishop of Durham still takes precedence immediately after the bishop of London.

Bibliography: J. L. Low, *Durham*, London, 1881 (in *Diocesan History Series*); idem, *Historical Scenes in Durham Cathedral*, ib. 1887; the works on the Cathedral of Durham by R. T. Talbot, London, 1893; J. T. Fowler, ib. 1898; and J. E. Bygate, ib. 1899. Consult also the publications of the Surtees Society, and *Archæologia Æliana*, Newcastle, 1856 sqq. (journal for the history of Durham).

DURIE (DURY), JOHN: A persistent Scotch advocate of Protestant union; b. in Edinburgh 1596; d. at Cassel Sept. 26, 1689. His father left Scotland because of his opposition to the policy of King James VI., and Durie, having completed his studies in Oxford, accepted the position of minister of the English settlers at Elbing just after Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden captured the city. There he became acquainted with Swedish Lutherans and was thus led in 1628 to a careful study of the differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed with a view to effecting a reconciliation between them. About that time Elbing was visited by the English ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, who became interested in Durie's plan and introduced him to Chancellor Oxenstierna. In 1630 Roe sent Durie to England with an indorsement of his project to the moderates among the bishops. In Germany the Lutherans and the Reformed then seemed to be drawing closer together, for at the conference at Leipsic in 1631 (see Leipsic, Colloquy of) both denominations were on remarkably friendly terms with each other. It seemed a favorable moment

to send Durie to the Continent in the interest of ecclesiastical peace, and he thus began an activity of almost fifty years as an itinerant advocate of union between the Reformed and the Lutherans.

Until the end of 1633 he traveled through Germany with letters of recommendation from Sir Thomas Roe, as well as from Archbishop Abbot of Canterbury and other bishops and theologians. Gustavus Adolphus received him at Würzburg and promised him a letter of recommendation to the Protestant princes of Germany. In 1633 Durie was recalled to England by the death of Archbishop Abbot, whose successor, Laud, supported him only after he had joined the Anglican Church and had been ordained in it. Aided by the recommendation of Laud and by English ambassadors, Durie labored, beginning with 1634, in Germany and Holland. In 1638 he was expelled from Sweden, but in 1639 he was in Denmark, where his reception was unfriendly, and in the following year he returned to Germany, associating chiefly with the dukes Augustus and George of Brunswick, who were Calixtine in sympathy.

The troubles in England called him home. From 1641 to 1644 he was an Anglican clergyman in The Hague, but in 1645, when Laud fell, he rejoined the Presbyterians. He labored as their associate in the eventful years 1645–49, taking part in the drafting of the Westminster Confession and the Westminster Catechism, but refusing to vote in favor of the king's death. During Cromwell's protectorate, Durie was a partizan of this powerful pioneer of religious liberty, joined the Independents, and was again sent to the Continent by Cromwell in 1654, though the plan of union was now restricted to the Reformed Churches. He visited Reformed theologians and statesmen in Switzerland, Germany, and Holland, and returned to England in 1657. Cromwell's death in 1658 and the restoration of 1660 interrupted all his efforts. With no more hope of governmental support of his plans for union, he could continue his work only in private and at his own risk. Despite his advanced age, he left England in 1661 and returned to his task of uniting the Protestant churches and of reconciling the Reformed and the Lutherans. He gained the sympathy of the Landgrave William VI. of Hesse-Cassel and the Elector Frederick William of Brandenburg, and after the early death of the former his widow, Hedwig Sophia, who ruled almost alone at Cassel from 1663 to 1683, remained Durie's patroness throughout the remainder of his life.

The majority of Lutheran theologians harshly rejected Durie's plans for reunion, especially as they were not clearly defined. At times he emphasized the so-called fundamental dogmas, but allowed variations in subordinate doctrines and their discussion, while at other times he urged that an entirely new confession should be formulated. His concept of fundamental doctrines was likewise very vague, since he sometimes defined them as the consensus of modern confessions, yet also classified them according to their teaching concerning God and Christ. The time was not yet ripe for an idea of such far-reaching importance, and thus Durie's life-work ended in apparent failure. In the dedication of a work on the Apocalypse of John (written in French and published at Frankfort, 1674) to his patroness, the landgravine of Hesse, he wrote: "The chief fruit of my labors is that I see that the misery of the Christians is far greater than the wretchedness of the heathen and other nations; I see the cause of the misery; I see the lack of remedy, and I see the cause of that lack. For myself, I see that I have no other profit than the witness of my conscience."

PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Among Durie's numerous works were *Sententiæ de pacis rationibus inter evangelicos*, published with declarations of various English bishops in 1634 (separately, 1638; Eng. transl., 1641); *A Summary Discourse concerning the Work of Peace Ecclesiastical* (Cambridge, 1641), presented to Sir Thomas Roe in 1639; *A Memorial concerning Peace Ecclesiastical* (London, 1641), addressed "to the king of England and the pastors and elders of the Kirk of Scotland meeting at St. Andrews"; *An Epistolary Discourse* (1644), concerning the toleration of independency; *A Model of Church Government* (1647); *The Reformed Library Keeper* (1650; ed. Ruth Shepard Grannis, with memoir, Chicago, 1906); *An Earnest Plea for Gospel Communion* (1654); *A Summary Platform of the Heade of a Body of Practical Divinity* (1654); *Irenicorum tractatuum prodromus* (Amsterdam, 1674). *The Reformed Librarie-keeper, or two copies of letter concerning the Place and Office of a Librarie-keeper* Chicago, 1906.

A list of his controversial works is given in R. Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica*, p. 324, Edinburgh, 1824, and of his other works in C. M. Pfaff, *Introductio in historiam theologiæ literariam*, Tübingen, 1720. The chief account of his life is in C. J. Benzel, *Dissertatio de J. Duræo*, Helmstadt, 1744. Consult further: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 866, 961, 1043, iv. 578, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; C. A. Briggs, *Presbyterian Review*, Apr. 1887; *DNB*, xvi. 261–263; K. Brauer, *Die Unionstätigkeit John Duries unter dem Protektorat Cromwells*, Marburg, 1907.

DURYEA, JOSEPH TUTHILL: Congregationalist; b. at Jamaica, N. Y., Dec. 9, 1832; d. at Boston, Mass., May 17, 1898. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1855 and Princeton Theological Seminary in 1859. He was then pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Troy, N. Y. (1859–62), Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York City (1862–67), Classon Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn (1867–79), Central Congregational Church, Boston, Mass. (1879–95), and First Reformed Dutch Church Brooklyn (1895–98). During the Civil War he took an active interest in the work of the Christian and Union commissions, and in the furtherance of their cause visited the army and delivered many addresses throughout the Northern States. While at Boston he was professor of Biblical theology in Andover Theological Seminary for two years, of political economy in Boston University for one year, and of philosophy in Wellesley College for eight years. He compiled *The Presbyterian Hymnal* (Philadelphia, 1874); *A Vesper Service for the Use of Congregations, Colleges, Schools, and Academies for Sunday Evening Worship* (1887); *A Morning Service for the Use of Congregations, Colleges, Schools, and Academies for Sunday Morning Worship* (1888); and *Selections from the Psalms and other Scriptures in the Revised Version for Responsive Reading*, in addition to a number of addresses and other occasional writings, mainly of a practical character.

DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH. See REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH; HOLLAND.

DUTOIT, dü''twā', **JEAN PHILIPPE:** French mystic; b. at Moudon (14 m. n.n.e. of Lausanne), Switzerland, Sept. 27, 1721; d. at Lausanne Jan. 21, 1793. He is usually called Dutoit-Membrini, after his mother. He studied theology at the academy of Lausanne, but in 1750 he was taken ill and believed that death was near. As he lay on the ground, he had a vision in which he saw his dead father who announced to him his speedy recovery. When he rose, he heard a voice saying: "Thou shalt eat of the flesh of thy Redeemer and drink of his blood." He at once felt the effect of these words, and a few days later he was far on the way to recovery. Shortly afterward Dutoit became acquainted with the writings of Madame Guyon and was soon one of her enthusiastic admirers. He vowed never to marry, and often preached in the churches at Lausanne, where he saw rich results from his discourses, although he could not be persuaded to take a permanent position. In 1759 his health obliged him to request that his name be stricken from the clerical list, and he then devoted himself to an earnest study of the Bible and the Fathers of the Church, especially the mystics. He corresponded with the famous men of his time, and gathered about him at Lausanne a small circle of enthusiasts. Despite the injurious reports circulated concerning him, especially at Geneva, and the suspicion of the government at Bern, his influence steadily increased. After his death a number of his followers, chiefly women, entered the Catholic Church, while others returned to the State Church or joined various sects.

Dutoit's chief works were his *Philosophie divine par Keleph ben Nathan* (3 vols., Lyons, 1793) and *Philosophie chrétienne* (4 vols., Lausanne, 1800), a collection of sermons published by his admirers. He also reedited the letters of Madame Guyon, and published a new edition of her works in forty volumes. Dutoit was guided in his labors by two points of view, since he opposed deism, unbelief, fanaticism, and magnetism, and strove to teach an inward and empirical Christianity as contrasted with an external faith based merely on historical belief and a superficial religious life. As in the case of mystics generally, the objective aspect of redemption, though by no means denied, was overshadowed by subjectivity, and justification by faith was not fully recognized. Dutoit accordingly disregarded the Moravians, and was equally unsympathetic with the Jansenists and Calvin. He made a laudable effort to establish the efficacy of grace, and avoided the harshness of particularism, although his system contains no satisfactory solution of the problem. He likewise rejected the certainty of the state of grace, coinciding here with Catholic doctrine. His Biblical and Protestant spirit, however, protected him from quietistic extremes. EUGÈNE CHOISY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Chavannes, *J. P Dutoit, sa vie, son caractère et ses doctrines*, Lausanne, 1865; A. Verdeil, *Hist. du canton de Vaud*, iii. 126–128, ib. 1852; H. L. J. Heppe, *Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik*, p. 515, Berlin, 1875; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 166–169.

DUTY: The moral obligation to do or omit to do something, also any act or omission which is perceived to be morally binding. The derivation of the word (due+ty) shows that a duty was originally thought of as something expected, or an obligation. Similarly, the derivation of the German *Pflicht* from the Old High German *phlegan, plegan* (Modern Germ. *pflegen*), shows an original connection of the idea with fixed custom or rule. As custom becomes law in an objective respect, so it becomes duty in a subjective respect. The doctrine of duty has formed a chief article of ethics since the earliest times. The Stoics in particular developed with peculiar care the conception of conduct in accordance with duty. They did not get beyond a eudemonistic principle, confined to this world, but still they understood by happiness a life according to nature, which they interpreted as a life in harmony with the divine reason of the universe. Cicero's work *De officiis* rests upon that of the Stoic Panætius. The first book treats of the *honestum*, the second of the *utile* and the third of the choice between the two. The same division and manner of treatment was adopted by Ambrose in a work of the same title. Neither of them brings to light a scientific principle and psychological motivation. Both wrote merely for practical purposes, Cicero for his son Marcus, and Ambrose for his young clergymen. However, these two works, with their superficial conceptions and accidental arrangement, formed the standard of ethics until Kant revealed the true essence of duty.

Duty is the form of ethical conduct. This form is conditioned by the law, by the unconditioned demand, "thou shalt," which through mediation by the conscience applies itself to the will of man and binds him to obedience. The consciousness of this obligation is Kant's "categorical imperative"; but Kant considered all morality as a legal fulfilment of duty, thus overlooking the radical nature of evil, which the law can repress but not eradicate. De Wette perceived this gap in Kant's system of morals and tried to bridge it over by adducing the fact of redemption. But it was Schleiermacher who, correcting the exaggeration of Kant, assigned to duty its proper place in ethics. Accordingly, the production or realization of the highest good is the moral task. Virtue is the moral power used for the performance of this task, and duty gives form to the virtuous moral action. The abnormal development of man under the dominion of sin makes the formula of duty, the law, indispensable, although it must be gradually dispensed with by the subversion of sin and the realization of the highest good.

The law defining duty becomes really moral only by its continual reference to redemption, which, by means of grace, has opened to sinful man the possibility of ethical action. In the conduct of the individual in accordance with duty there is always an additional factor besides the formula of duty as defined by the moral law. This is the "individual court of appeal," this expression being used to denote in a comprehensive sense the individual ethico-religious feeling and conscience.

In the doctrine of duties casuistry holds still a necessary place, since in practical life it is impossible to reduce moral law to an abstract formula. Ethics

can furnish only the general formulas of duty. Man himself must find his duty by applying the law to his own person, and he must shape his action in accordance with duty by resorting to his own "court of appeal." Since the Christian can perform an ethical act only in union with the Redeemer, and aided by his grace, no distinction can be drawn between religious and moral duties, or between duties toward God, our fellow men, and ourselves. As the Stoics taught, every sin is a sin against God. The proper division is suggested by the fact that we, on the one hand, imitate in our life the moral example of Christ, while, on the other hand, we have to cooperate in the realization of the moral community, the kingdom of God. Thus we may distinguish between duties toward ourselves and duties toward society. The Roman Catholic Church still holds to the so-called *consilia evangelica*, i.e., precepts of the Lord, or of the apostles, by means of which man may attain supererogatory merits and elevate himself to a higher plane of morality (see CONSILIA EVANGELICA). But there is nothing so excellent or sublime that it can not be expressed by the form of duty. Duty is the absolute standard of morality. See ETHICS.

(KARL BURGER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For works covering the subject consult ETHICS.

DU VERGIER (DU VERGER) DE HAURANNE, dü'vār"zhyĕ' de hō"rān', **JEAN** (usually called **Saint-Cyran** from the monastery of Saint Cyran-en-Brenne in Touraine): French theologian; b. at Bayonne 1581; d. at Paris Oct. 11, 1643. He studied theology at the University of Louvain, where the Church Fathers and Augustine were taught to the partial exclusion of the prevailing scholasticism, and at Paris in 1605 he met Cornelius Jansen (q.v.) with whom he formed an intimate friendship that lasted throughout his life. From 1611 to 1616 they lived in retirement near Bayonne, devoting themselves to patristic studies, but in 1617 Jansen returned to Louvain, and five years later Du Vergier settled in Paris. The two were, however, in constant correspondence on the subject of the great "reforms" which were stirring in the hearts of both. To Vincent de Paul, whom he sought to win over to his cause, Du Vergier declared that he had seen a great light, and that there was no church nor had there been one for five or six centuries; once it had been a bountiful stream of pure water, but was now a muddy channel. He characterized the Council of Trent as a political assembly, and declared that the first scholastics, together with Thomas Aquinas, had been the cause of great evils. In 1624 he came into conflict with the Jesuits through a book directed against Garasse, a member of the order, and the work was condemned by the Sorbonne at the instigation, the Jansenists claimed, of the Jesuits. A more lasting struggle began in 1631 with the publication of the *Opera* of a fictitious theologian Petrus Aurelius. This book was generally ascribed to Du Vergier, although the greater portion of it had been written by his nephew acting under his supervision. The work was based on the conflict which had been precipitated among English Catholics by the action of the papal vicar, who had curtailed the rights and privileges of the religious orders. This especially affected the Jesuits, who had been the most steadfast champions of the Roman Catholic cause in England since the reign of Henry VIII., and had consequently acquired special prerogatives. Aurelius accused the Jesuits of attempting to set up an invisible Church with Christ as its head purely for their own purposes. He repudiated their argument that the pope was the universal bishop from whom episcopal power emanated, basing the bishop's authority on the unction of the Holy Spirit. Against the services of the monastic orders to whom, as the Jesuits pointed out the introduction of Christianity into the British Islands had been due, Aurelius balanced the English secular clergy, who had cooperated with their French brethren in combating Pelagianism which the monks had always fostered. The Jesuit Sirmond replied to Aurelius, and the controversy soon included the entire subject of the secular clergy as opposed to the orders. The general assembly of the clergy lent its sanction to the work of Aurelius and caused it to be printed in 1641 and again in 1646; yet ten years later, in the first heat of the Jansenist conflict, it pronounced its condemnation on the book. In 1635 Saint-Cyran became confessor to the abbey of Port Royal (q.v.), and was spiritual director of the group of solitaries, among whom were the brothers Le Maître and Lancelot, who began to gather there after 1636. With characteristic zeal he preached of the sanctity of the priestly office and of the grace that should lie in the confessional and in public preaching. The hatred of envious priests roused Richelieu against him, and on May 14, 1638, he was sent a prisoner to the donjon of Vincennes. There he was confined until two months after the cardinal's death, when he came from his prison a broken man, whom the power of an untamed spirit alone kept to his duty until his death some eight months later. See JANSENISM. (C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Reuchlin, *Geschichte von Port Royal*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1839–44; Mrs. M. A. Schimmelpenninck, *Select Memoirs of Port Royal*, 3 vols., London, 1858; C. Beard, *Port Royal*, i. 113, 121–173, ib. 1861; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xi. 395–402.

DWIGHT, HENRY OTIS: Congregationalist; b. at Constantinople June 3, 1843. He entered Ohio Wesleyan University, but left at the close of his freshman year to enlist in the United States army at the outbreak of the Civil War. He was promoted adjutant, and was aide-de-camp to Major-General M. F. Force, and after the close of the war was treasurer of the Northampton (Mass.) Street Railway Company 1866–67. He was then business agent at Constantinople for the mission of the American Board from 1867 to 1872, and was engaged in editing their Turkish publications from 1872 to 1899. In 1901 he returned to America, and devoted himself to general literary and editorial work. In 1904–05 he was secretary of the Bureau of Missions in New York City, and in Jan., 1905, was appointed assistant to the secretaries of the American Bible Society and recording secretary in Jan., 1907. He was Constantinople correspondent of the *New*

York Tribune 1875–92, and edited the *Report of the Ecumenical Conference on Foreign Missions* (New York, 1900). He was editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopedia of Missions* (New York, 1904) and has written *Turkish Life in War Time* (New York, 1881); *Treaty Rights of American Missionaries in Turkey* (1893); *Constantinople and its Problems* (Chicago, 1901); and *Blue Book of Missions* (New York, 1905–09, a biennial).

DWIGHT, TIMOTHY: 1. Eighth president of Yale College; b. at Northampton, Mass., May 14, 1752; d. at New Haven, Conn., Jan. 11, 1817. He was graduated at Yale in 1769 and was tutor 1771–1777. For more than a year he was chaplain in the army during the Revolutionary War. From 1783 to 1795 he was at the head of an academy in Greenfield, Conn., and from 1795 till his death president of Yale, where he exerted an influence decisive for many years in the history of the college. His sermons in the college chapel constituted a system of divinity, and were published under the title *Theology Explained and Defended* (5 vols., Middletown, Conn., 1818; often reprinted). The work teaches a moderate Calvinism with an avoidance of extreme statements and metaphysical refinements. Besides minor publications he also wrote *The Conquest of Canaan, a Poem in Eleven Books* (Hartford, 1785); *Greenfield Hill, a Poem in Seven Parts* (New York, 1794); and *Travels in New England and New York* (4 vols., New Haven, 1821–22). The last-named work is a storehouse of facts, shrewd observations, and quaint comments. President Dwight was the author of the familiar hymn "I love thy kingdom, Lord." F. H. Foster.

Bibliography: The leading *Memoir* is by his son, Sereno Edwards Dwight, in *Theology Explained*, New York, 1846. Consult also: J. Sparks, *Library of American Biography*, vol. xiv., Boston, 1855; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii. 152–165, New York, 1859; M. C. Tyler, *Three Men of Letters*, pp. 69–127, ib. 1895.

2. Twelfth president of Yale College, grandson of the preceding; b. at Norwich, Conn., Nov. 16, 1828. He was educated at Yale (B.A., 1849), the Yale Divinity School (1850–53), and the universities of Berlin and Bonn (1856–58). He was tutor in Greek at Yale from 1851 to 1855 and professor of New Testament Greek in the Divinity School from 1858 to 1886. In the latter year he was elected president, and held this position until 1899. He was a member of the American committee for the revision of the English version of the Bible and for several years was one of the editors of *The New Englander*. He has written *Thoughts of and for the Inner Life* (sermons; New York, 1899) and *Memories of Yale Life and Men* (1903), and prepared the American edition of Meyer's commentary on Romans (New York, 1884), several other Pauline Epistles and on the Epistle to the Hebrews (1885), and the Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude (1887), as well as of F. Godet's commentary on the Gospel of John (1886).

DYKES, JAMES OSWALD: English Presbyterian; b. at Port Glasgow (17 m. w.n.w. of Glasgow), Renfrewshire, Scotland, Aug. 14, 1835. He studied at the University of Edinburgh (M.A., 1854), New College, Edinburgh (1855–58), and the universities of Heidelberg (1856) and Erlangen (1857). He was minister of the Free Church of Scotland, East Kilbride, Lanarkshire, 1859–61 and assistant minister of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, 1861–65. He then resigned on account of ill health and spent three years without a charge in Melbourne, Australia, delivering occasional lectures and filling various temporary posts in the Presbyterian Church. After his return to England he was minister of Regent Square Church London, 1869–88, to 1907 principal and Barbour professor of theology in the College of the Presbyterian Church of England (Westminster College, Cambridge), since emeritus-principal. He was the chief author of the new creed adopted by the Presbyterian Church of England in 1890. He has written *On the Written Word* (London, 1868); *Beatitudes of the Kingdom* (1872); *Laws of the Kingdom* (1873); *Relations of the Kingdom* (1874); *From Jerusalem to Antioch : Sketches of the Primitive Church* (1874); *Abraham the Friend of God* (1877); *Daily Prayers for the Household* (1881); *Sermons* (1882); *Laws of the Ten Words* (1884); *The Gospel according to St. Paul : Studies in the Epistle to the Romans* (1888); and *Plain Words on Great Themes* (1892).

E

E: The symbol employed to designate the Elohistic (Ephraimitic) document which, according to the critical school, is one of the components of the Hexateuch (q.v.). See Hebrew Language and Literature, II., 4.

EACHARD, JOHN: English clergyman and satirist; b. in Suffolk c. 1636; d. at Cambridge July 7, 1697. He studied at Catherine Hall, Cambridge, of which he became Master in 1675. He was created D.D., by royal mandamus in 1675 and was elected vice-chancellor of the university in 1679 and again in 1695. He published anonymously his famous essay, *The Grounds and Decisions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion, inquired into in a Letter to R. L.* (London, 1670), in which he attributed the failure of the clergy to their defective education. Other works from his pen are, *Some Observations upon the Answer to an Enquiry in a second Letter to R. L.* (London, 1671), a sequel to the foregoing; *Mr. Hobbs' State of Nature* (London, 1672); and *Some Opinions of Mr. Hobbs* (1673). Eachard was master of a light bantering style that was particularly effective in satire, but he

did not succeed in serious writing. The best collected edition of his works was published in London in three volumes, 1774.

Bibliography: A *Life*, by T. Davies, is prefixed to the *Collected Works*, ut sup.; *DNB*, xvi. 302–303.

EADFRID (EADFRITH, EDFRID): Eighth bishop of Lindisfarne, 698 till his death in 721. He was an ardent disciple of St. Cuthbert (q.v.) and the great aim of his life was to honor his master. He repaired Cuthbert's oratory on Farne Island, and at his solicitation the anonymous life of Cuthbert was written, as well as both of the lives by Bede, the one in prose being dedicated to Eadfrid and his monks. The so-called "Durham Book" or "Lindisfarne Gospels," a manuscript of Jerome's version of the four Gospels with the addenda usual in such manuscripts, beautifully written on vellum in half-uncial letters, now in the British Museum, is believed with good reason to have been originally written and illuminated by Eadfrid. His successor at Lindisfarne, Ethelwald, adorned the work with gold and jewels, and in the tenth century a certain Aldred added an interlinear gloss in the Northumbrian dialect. The manuscript is one of the most beautiful in Europe and testifies to Eadfrid's skill. The Latin text and Aldred's glosses were edited for the Surtees Society by J. Stevenson and G. Waring (4 parts, 1854–65) and for the Cambridge Press by J. M. Kemble, C. Hardwick, and W. W. Skeat (1858–78).

Bibliography: Sources are in: Symeon of Durham, *Historia Dunelmensis ecclesiæ*, ed. T. Arnold, *Rolls Series*, no. 75, vol. i. passim, London, 1879; Bede, *Vita Cuthberti*, preface. Consult also *DNB*, xvi. 306–307.

EADIE, JOHN: United Presbyterian Church of Scotland; b. at Alva (7 m. n.e. of Stirling), Stirlingshire, May 9, 1810; d. at Glasgow June 3, 1876. He was educated at the University of Glasgow and in the theological seminary of the United Secession Church. He was ordained Sept. 24, 1835, to the pastorate of the Cambridge Street Church, Glasgow, which he retained until, in 1863, he removed with a portion of his people, to form the new Lansdowne Church, of which he was minister until his death. As early as his student days, he showed his leaning to the department of exegesis, in which he achieved his greatest success; and he had so diligently given himself to Biblical study in later years, that, on the death of Dr. John Mitchell, he was elected by the denominational synod (May 5, 1843) to the professorship of Biblical literature in its divinity hall. Such an appointment at that time did not involve the dissolution of the pastoral relationship, and for thirty-three years Dr. Eadie performed the duties of both pastor and professor, finding in the professorship the great sphere of his life.

As a preacher, his manner was not elegant and his utterance was often indistinct; but his sermons were eminently instructive. He was particularly excellent as an expositor. As a professor he was affable, easy, and natural, and possessed the magnetic influence which kindles enthusiasm. His scholarship was broad and accurate, and was so generally recognized that he was chosen a member of the New Testament revision company. His commentaries are marked by candor and clearness, as well as by an "evangelical unction" not common in works of the kind.

Besides contributions to periodicals and encyclopedic works, he prepared a condensed edition of Cruden's concordance (Glasgow, 1840), and compiled *A Biblical Cyclopædia* (Edinburgh, 1848; new ed., rewritten, 1869). *An Analytic Concordance to the Holy Scriptures* appeared in London, 1856, and *An Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia* in 1861. He published two volumes of discourses, *The Divine Love* (London, 1855) and *Paul the Preacher* (1859). Further mention may be made of his biography of John Kitto (Edinburgh, 1857) and *The English Bible, an External and Critical History of the Various English Translations of Scripture, with Remarks on the Need of Revising the English New Testament* (2 vols., London, 1876). *Scripture Illustrations from the Domestic Life of the Jews and Other Eastern Nations* appeared posthumously (1877). His fame, however, rests on his commentaries on the Greek text of the epistles, viz. *Ephesians* (London, 1854), *Colossians* (1856), *Philippians* (1859), *Galatians* (1869), and *I Thessalonians* (1877).

Bibliography: James Brown, *Life of John Eadie*, London, 1878; *DNB*, xvi. 307–309.

EADMER (EDMER): Monk of Canterbury; b. probably c. 1060; d. at Canterbury Jan. 13, 1124 (?). He first appears as the close companion of Anselm after the latter became archbishop of Canterbury (1093); according to William of Malmesbury, Anselm esteemed him so highly that he never rose from bed without Eadmer's command. After Anselm's death he continued associated with Archbishop Ralph, and, in 1120, was chosen by king Alexander of Scotland for the archbishopric of St. Andrews, but, owing to the bitter rivalry between Canterbury and the northern see, was never consecrated. Eadmer is one of the best of early English historians; he avoids trivial details and is uncommonly incredulous for his time concerning alleged miracles; his style is good and approaches classical models. His *Historia novorum* or "History of his own Times," in six books, extends practically from the Conquest to 1122; it treats especially matters connected with the Church, which he remarks he had been accustomed to note from early childhood, and recounts the deeds of the two archbishops with whom he was connected; it shows strong national feeling and asserts the rights and privileges of the English Church. The best edition is by M. Rule in the *Rolls Series* (no. 81, 1884). Besides minor works he wrote lives of Anselm (ed. Rule in the *Rolls Series*, ut sup.); Dunstan; Bregwin, archbishop of Canterbury, 759–763; Oswald, archbishop of York (the last three in Wharton, *Anglia sacra*, ii., London, 1691), and Wilfrid of York (ed. J. Raine in *The Historians of the Church of York*, i., *Rolls Series*, no. 73). His collected works are in *MPL*, clix. 345 sqq., and extracts are in *MGH, Script.*, xiii. (1881), 139–146.

Bibliography: William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, in *Rolls Series*, No. 52, London, 1870; T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, Anglo-Saxon period, ib. 1842; J. Collier, *Eccl Hist.*, vol. ii., ib. 1845; P. Ragey, *Eadmer*, Paris, 1892; *DNB*, xvi. 309–310.

EASTER.

I. The Celebration.
1. Names and their Significance.
2. Origin of the Celebration.
Testimony of the Ante-Nicene Period (§ 1).
Testimony of the Post-Nicene Period (§ 2).
Conclusions (§ 3).
3. The Day of Celebration.
4. Rites of Celebration.
Prior to 300 A.D. (§ 1).
In the Post-Nicene Period and Middle Ages (§ 2).
In Modern Times (§ 3).
II. The Paschal Controversies.
The Quartodecimans of Asia Minor (§ 1).
Documentary Bases and Harmonistic Calculations (§ 2).
Controversy in the Second Century (§ 3).
The Nicene Decision as to Date of Celebration (§ 4).
III. The Easter Cycle.

I. The Celebration.—1. Names and Their Significance: EASTER, the festival of our Lord's resurrection is, with Christmas, the most joyous festival observed by the Church. The English Easter and the German equivalent *Ostern*, are derived from the Anglo-Saxon *Ostarâ* or *Eâstre*, the name of the goddess of spring and the dawn (cf. Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary;* Bede, *De ratione temporum*, xv.). The French *pâques* and the terms used in the other Romance languages are derived from the Hebrew *pesaḥ*, "Passover." In the early Church the term *pascha* was used for the festival next preceding Pentecost, whatever it was that that festival commemorated (see PENTECOST). It remains to show whether the term stood only for the festival of the death of Christ, or for both the festivals of the death and resurrection, or for the festival of the resurrection alone. It is certain that if the resurrection of Christ was annually commemorated, the festival of commemoration was called *pascha* and by no other distinctive term. The word *pascha* was at first derived from Gk. *paschein*, "to suffer" (so Tertullian, *adv. Jud.;* Irenæus, *Hær.*, iv. 23, etc.). Later the true derivation from the Hebrew *pesaḥ* was recognized and the meaning *diabasis, transitus*, "passing over" was given to it (e.g., by Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermo* xlv., *MPL*, xxxvi. 636; Augustine, *Epist.*, lv., *MPL*, xxxiii. 205). After the year 300 the day of the resurrection was called the "day alone great" by Leo I. (*Sermo de resurrectione Domini, MPL*, liv. 498), "the most royal day of days," by Gregory Nazianzen (*MPG*, xxxv. 1017); "the festival of festivals," "the happiest of days," and by other designations which show that it was looked upon after that date, if not before, as the most joyous and important festival of the year. John of Damascus has given expression to the devout feelings of the ancient Church in regard to Easter in his resurrection hymn:

> The day of resurrection, earth, tell it out abroad,
> The passover of gladness, the passover of God.

2. Origin of the Celebration: Two questions present themselves: (1) When did the custom of the yearly commemoration of the resurrection begin? (2) on what day of the week and what day of the year was the festival celebrated? For the period after the Council of Nicæa (325), the difficulty largely vanishes. The comparatively lengthy statement of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* V., xxiii.–xxv.) does not relieve the difficulty for the ante-Nicene period, but by its vagueness, growing out of what Eusebius assumes to be known, rather increases the difficulty. If we were in possession of the lost tracts called forth in the third century by the paschal controversies (see below, II.), to which Eusebius makes reference, all uncertainty might be removed.

1. Testimony of the Ante-Nicene Period.

The only possible allusion in the New Testament to the observance of a Christian Passover, or festival of the death of Christ, is I Cor. v. 7, where "Christ our Passover" is said to have been sacrificed for us. That the Jewish Christians continued to keep the Jewish festivals is altogether probable, if not certain, from Paul's habit. On the other hand, Paul seems to disparage the observance of special festivals except the first day of the week (I Cor. xvi. 2). What was the custom of the Gentile Christians? Did they also keep the season devoted to the Jewish Passover, putting into it Christian ideas? And if so, did they observe it as a commemoration of the resurrection of Christ as well as of his death and burial? In the literature of the subapostolic age, (excepting Justin Martyr) there is no reference to a celebration of a yearly festival of the resurrection or *pascha*. There is no hint of anything of that kind in the Didache. Trypho charged the Christians with not keeping the Jewish feasts or the Sabbaths; the reply was that Christians did not place any virtue in keeping such festivals (Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, x.). From Tertullian it seems to be evident that there was a struggle between the Jewish and Gentile elements in the Church over what was included under the feast of the *pascha* and a struggle within the Gentile portion of the Church as to whether any yearly festivals were to be observed. Tertullian says: if the Apostle set aside all special reverence for days and months and years, why do we celebrate the *pascha* in the first month of each year? (*De jejuniis*, xiv., *ANF*, iv. 112). It is evident from this that the *pascha* was observed. But that there was a difference in respect to what was included under the term *pascha* is evident from Tertullian. In his *De oratione* (viii.) he refers to it as Friday the day of the Lord's death, and in *De corona* (iii., *ANF*, iii. 94) he says: "we count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday." Similarly in *De baptismo* (xix., *ANF*, iii. 678) he says that they did not fast on the Lord's Day and that the period between the day of the *pascha* and Pentecost the Christian spent in joy. From this it seems to be apparent that the whole season of the *pascha* was observed with sadness and grief. So far then it would appear that the *pascha* observance was a time of grief and it is left uncertain whether the resurrection was observed annually by a special day, or, if observed at all, whether it was observed separately from the festival of the death of Christ.

The next point of approach is through Eusebius

(*Hist. eccl.* V., xxiii.-xxv., *NPNF*, 2d ser., i. 241 sqq.). In this famous passage the historian has especially in mind the conflict as to the day of the week and of the year on which *pascha* was to be celebrated. He records that as early as the middle of the second century, there was dispute over this double question, Polycarp of Asia Minor and Anicetus of Rome being at that time the representatives of the two views. Eusebius further says that the churches in Asia Minor derived their custom of observing the *pascha* from the Apostle John and Philip. Without doubt Christian elements were incorporated into the celebration. It was not a question of whether a day corresponding to the Passover should be celebrated, but a question of the time at which it was to be celebrated. Further, according to Eusebius, the churches of Asia Minor finished "their fasting on the festival of the Savior's passover." This was the 14th of Nisan. In other parts of the Church, Eusebius goes on to say, it was not their custom "to end it on this day" but, "on no other day than that of the Lord's resurrection." From this it would seem on the surface that in Asia Minor the Churches finished the fasting on the day set apart for the *pascha*, that is in all probability the day commemorating the crucifixion, and in the rest of the world they carried the fasting over to Sunday. Joy is not mentioned as an element in the celebration in the case either of Asia Minor or of the rest of the world, so that if the resurrection was celebrated at all as a separate feast, Eusebius does not indicate it. We can not think that, if the resurrection was celebrated, fasting and grief entered into its observance, as has been deduced from this statement of Eusebius. (For the fast preceding Easter, see FASTING, II., §. 3). To this passage of Eusebius have been added recently passages from the Canons of Hippolytus (*TU*, vi. 4, pp. 115–116) and from Aphraates (ed. Bert, *TU*, new ser., iii. pp. 170–171). The former speaks of the *pascha* as a time of fasting and lamentation. Aphraates also (cf. Bert, in *TU*, ut sup. p. 83) seems not to have in mind the resurrection when he speaks of the Christian *pascha*. However, Alexander of Egypt (d. 264, Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, iii. 223 sqq.) distinguishes the festivals of the death and of the resurrection.

2. Testimony of the Post-Nicene Period.

From these unsatisfactory notices, different views have been deduced. Neander, Hilgenfeld and P. Schaff have held that in the second and third centuries the *pascha* included the celebration of the resurrection and death of Christ; Steitz and Drews only the death; while Schürer, Karl Müller, and others hold the modified view that it celebrated the completion of the full work of redemption and not specifically either the death or the resurrection. It must be said that the silence of the writers of the ante-Nicene period, who give such scant notice of the *pascha* feast, can not safely be interpreted to mean that the resurrection was not celebrated as a distinct part of the *pascha* festival. The few extant notices, taken by themselves, seem to favor the theory that there was but one festival of the *pascha* and that it included the death and the resurrection. Certainly in the fourth century the term *pascha* stood for both the resurrection and the death of Christ. It was then called "the holy feast, the pascha of our salvation" as by the Council of Antioch 341 (canon i., Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 513); and Athanasius frequently describes the *pascha* as a feast of joy at which the Lord himself is the festival. It is a festival of redemption (cf. "Festal Letters," *ANF*, 2d ser., iv. 506–556). Finally, in the fourth century *pascha* came to be used in a limited sense for Easter Sunday alone, as by the Councils of Arles 314, Carthage 397, and the First Synod of Toledo 400 (canon xx.). Contemporaneously the whole feast of the *pascha* was known under the two names the *pascha* of the crucifixion and the *pascha* of the resurrection. They were parts of a single festival.

3. Conclusions.

3. The Day of Celebration: As already indicated, Eusebius states that there was a wide difference in the customs prevalent in Asia Minor and the rest of the Christian world in regard to the day of the year and of the week on which the *pascha* festival was to be celebrated. The Christians of Asia Minor were called Quartodecimans from their custom of celebrating the *pascha* invariably on the 14th of Nisan, the first month of the Jewish year and falling in the springtime. The date might fall on Friday or on any of the other days of the week, which fact made no difference in the celebration of the paschal feast. For this reason the day of the resurrection did not always fall on a Sunday. In the churches of the West and also in parts of the East a different custom prevailed. The result of these differences was that different sections of the Church might and did observe the *pascha* on different dates. Out of this difference grew the Paschal Controversies, so-called (see II., below). The Council of Nicæa had for its second object the unification of the date of the Christian *pascha*, which the Council of Arles (314) had referred to as a most desirable thing "that the *pascha* of the Lord should be observed on one day and at one time throughout the world" (cf. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 205). The decree of Nicæa fixed as Easter Sunday the Sunday immediately following the fourteenth day of the so-called paschal moon, which happens on or first after the vernal equinox. The vernal equinox invariably falls on Mar. 21. Easter, then, can not occur earlier than Mar. 22, or later than Apr. 25. In the former case the fourteenth day of the moon would coincide with Mar. 21, the day of the vernal equinox. In the latter, the fifteenth day of the moon would happen on Mar. 21, and a whole lunar month would have to intervene before the condition, "the fourteenth day of the moon first after the vernal equinox," was fulfilled; and, as this might be Sunday, Easter Sabbath would not occur till seven more days had elapsed, i.e., Apr. 25.

4. Rites of Celebration: Up to the year 300 notices are very scant. Eusebius states that the *pascha* was celebrated with mourning, and that church synods (exclusive of those in Asia Minor) ordered that "the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord" should be observed only on the Lord's

day and that on that day "the close of the paschal fast" should be observed. The *pascha* was a time of fasting. "The mystery of the resurrection of the Lord" must refer to the Eucharist. Tertullian (*Ad uxorem*, ii. 4) and others refer to vigils extending into the night of Saturday or until the cockcrowing of the Sunday morning (*Apostolic Constitutions*, *ANF*, vii. 447). The chief source of information is the *Didaskalia* (xxi., *Apostolic Constitutions*, v. 18–19) which speaks of the fasting beginning on the Monday of the paschal week and continuing with growing rigor into Saturday night, and adds that on Saturday night the whole congregation met and engaged in prayer, especially for the Jews, and in reading from the Scripture. Sunday was then observed by the meeting together of rich and poor in the love-feast and the Eucharist.

1. Prior to 300 A.D.

After 300 notices of the festivities of Easter are frequent and many sermons on the *pascha* are preserved in Ambrose, Augustine, and other writers. The day was looked upon as the most joyous festival of the year. The week beginning with Easter Sunday was observed with special religious festivities and each day had its sermon. Easter Sunday was called *dominica in albis* (see ALB; CATECHUMENATE, § 4) or *octava infantium* and the Sunday closing Easter week was called *octava paschæ* or *pascha clausum*. Ambrose in his sermon on the "Mystery of the Pascha" (*MPL*, xvii. 695) gives full expression to the joyous feelings which were involved in Easter. He called the day the real beginning of the year, the opening of the months, the new revival of the seeds and the restoration of the joy interrupted by the cold of winter. On that day God, as it were, relights the sun and gives light to the moon. The Easter celebration began on Saturday, sometimes as early as three o'clock in the afternoon, as is stated to have been the case in Jerusalem by the "Itinerary" of Silvia (cf. Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xiv. 743). This Saturday celebration was known as the Easter or Paschal Vigils. Augustine called this vigil the "mother of all the sacred vigils" (*Sermo* ccxix., *MPL*, xxxviii. 1088), and says that even the heathen kept awake on that night. According to Lactantius (*De divinis institutionibus*, VII., xix., *ANF*, vii. 215) and Jerome (on Matt. xxv. 6, *MPL*, xxvi. 184), the Lord was expected to return at that time. The celebration is referred to by other authors, in missals, in the codes of Theodosius and Justinian and in the acts of councils. The services in the churches consisted of readings from the Law, the Prophets and the narratives of the Lord's passion, in the administration of baptism and confirmation, and ended with the Eucharist. For Spain and Gaul these services are recorded in the Mozarabic Liturgy (*MPL*, lxxxv.), and in the Gothic missal, the Gallic missal, the Gallic sacramentary and the Lectionary of Luxeuil (all in *MPL*, lxxii.). The use of lighted candles became universal and is attested as the custom in Rome at least as early as the middle of the third century. The *Canons* of Hippolytus (*TU*, vi. 4, p. 136) say "that on the night of the resurrection no one should sleep and every one should have a light, for on that night the Redeemer made every one free from the darkness of sin and the grave." Augustine bears witness to the custom of lighting and carrying candles. Eusebius says that the whole city of Constantinople was illuminated with wax candles and columns of wax ("Life of Constantine," iv. 22). Gregory Nazianzen (d. 390) and Gregory of Nyssa (d. 395, "Oration on the pascha," xlii.) speak of persons of all ranks carrying tapers and lamps. The custom of the paschal fire was also an early institution and can be traced back to 600 at least as in vogue in France. Alcuin (*De divinis officiis*, xvi. 17, *MPL*, ci. 1205) and Boniface (d. 752, *MPL*, lxxxix. 951) definitely refer to it. The new fire was struck from a stone and the tapers and candles lighted from it. Perhaps the custom was drawn from the ceremony of the Romans at the altar of Vesta at the opening of the New Year, Mar. 1. The symbolical significance of such an act, as a means of instruction to the people and as an expression of piety for the new light brought into the world by the resurrection is so natural that it is not necessary to fall back upon the old Roman ceremony. In Gaul the custom was also observed, how widely is not known, of placing five pieces of incense in the great paschal candle to symbolize the five wounds of Christ. The codes of Theodosius and Justinian recognized the joyous character of the day by encouraging the emancipation of slaves and the liberation of minor criminals, and ordering the omission of spectacular entertainments during Easter week. It was also made a time for the presentation of gifts and the distribution of alms. The acts of councils (Orléans, 538, Macon, 581, and others) down through the Middle Ages to the Fourth Lateran (1215) and later councils forbade the Jews to tread the streets or to show themselves out of doors from Maundy Thursday till after Easter, lest the joy of the Christians should be interrupted.

2. In the Post-Nicene Period and Middle Ages.

At the present time the religious festivities of Easter time in the Greek and Latin Churches involve the substantial elements in the ancient custom of the day. Elaborate solemn rites are observed on Saturday and until the cockcrowing of Easter morning when the tapers (extinguished on Good Friday) are lighted with the words "The Light of Christ." In the church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem until a few years ago the pious fraud of the "holy fire" was perpetrated by the Greek patriarch who presented from the sacred tomb three times a lighted taper or torch which he declared had been lighted by a miracle without human intervention. The spectators, wrought to great excitement, struggled to light their tapers at the miraculous fire, and then carried it throughout the Greek world. Often disgraceful scenes occurred and the intervention of the Turkish soldiery was required to prevent or check violence. In the twelfth century Saladin is said by an early tradition to have witnessed this miracle and acknowl-

3. In Modern Times.

edged its miraculous character (*Itinerarium Ricardi* I. v. 16, ed. W Stubbs, London, 1864). Easter is observed throughout the Continent by the various bodies of Protestants. The Church of England has always observed the day and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America follows it. The Puritans abolished all special recognition of the festival. The churches of Scotland as well as the different non-episcopal branches of the Protestant Church in America are more and more using the day as a means of commemorating the resurrection of the Lord, confirming the faith of men in the hope of the resurrection, and giving expression to the joyous character of the Christian religion.

D. S. Schaff.

II. The Paschal Controversies: While Jewish Christians for a time celebrated the Jewish Passover, the practise of the Church was not uniform either in the day or in the ideas and customs attaching to what eventually became the Easter festival. The Christians of Asia Minor celebrated the Jewish Passover on the 14th of Nisan, uniting with it, according to some, the commemoration of the departure of Jesus from his disciples and the institution of the Lord's Supper. According to others, the day was celebrated in strict obedience to Jewish law, without any allusion to Gospel history. A third view maintains that the Christians of Asia Minor celebrated on the 14th of Nisan the memory of the death of Jesus. But the grounds of the controversy must be sought elsewhere. If the sources are examined without prejudice and without regard to criticism of the Gospels, a different result must necessarily be reached concerning the significance and import of the celebration. Eusebius says that it was decided on the basis of numerous conferences of bishops that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord from the dead should be celebrated on no other day than on the Lord's day and on that day the Easter fast should be broken (*Hist. eccl.*, V. xxiii. 2, *NPNF*, 2d ser., i. 241). Hence it is evident that the party who were opposed in the conferences, who were undoubtedly the Christians of Asia Minor, must have celebrated the mystery of the resurrection on the day on which the fast was broken, and that this day was not Sunday but the 14th of Nisan, around which the controversy revolved. This conclusion is justified by the account of Epiphanius concerning the Quartodecimans (that is, those who commemorated the Lord's death on the 14th), in which he relates that fasting and the celebration of the resurrection took place on the same day. It is hardly conceivable that a bitter and protracted controversy should have originated on a mere matter of fasting; the real reason for the differences lay deeper. The Christians of Asia Minor appealed to an old apostolic tradition according to which Jesus rose on the evening of the day of his death, and the opposition of the Occidentals was directed mainly against the commemoration of death and resurrection on the same day.

1. The Quartodecimans of Asia Minor.

The Syriac Didascalia makes an attempt to harmonize the tradition of the canonical Gospels and that of the Christians of Asia Minor. On the morning of Friday Jesus was led before Pilate and crucified on the same day. He suffered six hours, and those are counted as one day. Then there was a darkness, lasting three hours, and that is counted as a night, and further, from the ninth hour till evening three hours,—another day, and then followed the night of the Sabbath. In the Gospel of Matthew we read, "Now late on the sabbath day as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene," etc. (Matt. xxviii. 1, R. V.). The calculation is strange, but its purpose is easily seen. The author believed that Jesus rose on the evening of the Friday on which he suffered death. In order to reconcile this tradition with the other which assumed a resurrection on the third day, he calculated (as above) in such a way that Jesus really rose after two days and two nights although only one day had passed. It is not known whether Friday of every week was celebrated by fasts and the mysteries of resurrection or the 14th of each month or the 14th of Nisan in each year. In the Orient, Sunday was not known as the day of resurrection, and hence there was no weekly celebration of this day, but in the Occident Wednesday and Friday were regular fast-days, and Sunday was celebrated as the day of resurrection. It is doubtful whether the Occident possessed in addition a special day in the year for the commemoration of the death and the resurrection of the Lord.

2. Documentary Bases and Harmonistic Calculations.

When Polycarp visited Anicetus in Rome (c. 154), the celebration of Passover was discussed, but no agreement was arrived at. Polycarp appealed to the old age of the tradition in Asia Minor, Anicetus to the Roman tradition. Neither made concessions, but there was no rupture. At the beginning of the paschal controversies, there arose also the heresy of the Montanists who by means of the Egyptian calendar designated the seventh of April as the day of the death of Christ on which they annually celebrated Passover without regard to the day of the week and the phase of the moon. This revolutionary spirit was opposed by the representatives of the Church of Asia Minor, especially by Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, but, owing to his disagreement with the Church of Asia Minor, Victor of Rome was favorably inclined toward the Montanists. He attempted to exclude the churches of the province of Asia from the orthodox Church, but Polycarp of Smyrna defended the old custom so that the measures of Rome could not be carried out. Most of the bishops took the part of Polycarp. Even Irenæus wrote to Victor in the name of the Gallican bishops, exhorting him to be moderate. The leaders of the Church of Palestine, such as Narcissus of Jerusalem, Theophilus of Cæsarea, also the bishops of Pontus and Gaul, and the Church of Alexandria stood on the side of Victor, appealing to the tradition of the Apostles, while Syria, Mesopotamia and Persia

3. Controversy in the Second Century.

took the part of Asia Minor. Victor was not successful in subjecting the Asiatics to his views; on the other hand the Church of Asia Minor was not able to influence the Western Church to abandon the celebration of Sunday in favor of an account of the resurrection which was in evident contradiction to the prophecies of the Old Testament, to the tradition of Paul and the acknowledged Gospels, and in favor of a custom that was based merely upon the appeal to traditions which could not claim equal authority with the Gospels and apostles. Clement of Alexandria, as the representative of the view of the churches in Palestine and Alexandria, seems to have influenced the final result of the controversy.

For the following period the more important problem was the calculation of the term of Passover and Easter. In Asia Minor this question was not raised. The Jews strictly insisted that their festival should take place at the time of full moon, but beyond this they attempted no accurate calculation. It was probably in Egypt that the vernal equinox and the next full moon were first taken into consideration as fixed points in the calculation of Easter.

In Rome there developed in the mean time a different calculation of the festival of Easter which, beside the celebration of Sunday as the day of resurrection, formed an object of dispute between the two parties. According to a statement of Tertullian, Easter was celebrated annually in the first month, i.e., March. But if Easter is calculated after the full moon which follows the spring equinox, it does not always take place in the month of March. Consequently at the time when Tertullian made this statement (in the beginning of the third century), Easter must have been celebrated in Carthage and in the Occident on an immovable day in the month of March. As Tertullian in another place designates the twenty-fifth of March as the day of the death of Christ, and as this tradition is very frequently in evidence in the whole Occident, it is to be assumed that in the Occident there began a fast on that date which was broken on the following Sunday in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. At the Council of Nicæa an attempt was made to abolish the differences between the various churches and to introduce the Egyptian calculation into all provinces. Easter was to be celebrated on the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox. But by this decision a uniform regulation of the question was not guaranteed, as is evident from the necessity of reaffirming the decision at the Synod of Antioch in 341. An anti-Judaistic polemic which is noticeable in the regulation of the question since the third century has undoubtedly influenced to a great extent the final victory of the custom of Palestine and Egypt. In spite of the decision of the councils, the churches of Mesopotamia, Antioch, and Syria adhered to the old custom.

4. The Nicene Decision as to the Date of Celebration.

(Erwin Preuschen.)

III. The Easter Cycle: This is a determinate series of years such that in each series Easter Sunday always recurs in the same sequence on the same day of the month. Such a cycle exists for the Julian calendar and comprises 532 years. Besides this cycle there is another, consisting of eighty-four years, which is mentioned at the close of the third century but which was later superseded by the cycle of 532 years because it was found that the computation was wrong. A lunar cycle of nineteen years is also named and only in this sense can an Easter cycle be connected with the Gregorian calendar.

Carl Bertheau.

Bibliography: On I.: Bingham, *Origines*, XX. v.; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. ii., Leipsic, 1818; F. Piper, *Geschichte des Osterfestes*, Berlin, 1845; H. Alt, *Der christliche Cultus*, part ii., Berlin, 1850; W I. Zip, *Hist., Object and Proper Observance of the Holy Season of Lent*, New York, 1875; E. Renan, *L'Église chrétienne*, pp. 445–451, Paris, 1879; idem, *M. Aurèle*, pp. 194–206, ib. 1882, Eng. transl. of both vols., London, n.d.; F. X. Kraus, *Realencyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, i. 486–502, Freiburg, 1881; J. H. Hobart, *Festivals and Feasts*, London, 1887; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, pp. 226 sqq., Paris, 1889, Eng. transl., *Christian Worship*, pp. 236–239 et passim, London, 1904; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. 180 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; idem, *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, chap. vi., ib. 1894; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 149, 297–300 et passim, ii.–iv. passim; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. i. passim, Eng. transl., vol. i.; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 206–209; *DCB*, i. 586–595; *DCG*, i. 255; E. C. Achelis, *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie*, i. 292 sqq., Leipsic, 1898; G. Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, i. 172 sqq., Berlin, 1900.

On II.: C. L. Weitzel, *Die christliche Passafeier der drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, Pforzheim, 1848; A. Hilgenfeld, *Der Paschastreit der alten Kirche*, Halle, 1860; W F. Hook, *Archbishops of Canterbury*, i. chap. i., London, 1860; F. C. Baur, *Das Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, pp. 156–169, Tübingen, 1863; W Milligan, *The Easter Controversies of the Second Century in their Relation to the Gospel of St. John*, in *Contemporary Review*, Sept., 1867; J. F. S. Gordon, *Scotichronicon*, i. 60–65, Glasgow, 1867; E. Schürer, *De controversiis paschalibus*, Leipsic, 1869; idem, in *ZHT*, 1870, pp. 182 sqq.; L. Duchesne, *La Question de la Pâque*, in *Revue des questions historiques*, July, 1880; G. Salmon, *Historical Introduction to the N. T.*, lect. xv., London, 1894; McGiffert in *NPNF*, 2d ser., i. 241; Neander, ut sup., i. 297–300, ii. 337–338, iii. 347, 585; Schaff, ut sup.. ii., 209–220.

On III.: Van der Hagen, *Dissertationes de cyclis paschalibus*, Amsterdam, 1736; L. Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, ii. 191–298, Berlin, 1826; idem, *Lehrbuch der Chronologie*, pp. 345–379, ib. 1831; B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlichen mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipsic, 1880; H. Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, p. 144, Hanover, 1891.

EASTER COMMUNION: The celebration of the Lord's Supper early became one of the chief of the rites connected with Easter. Those who had become cold and lax in their attention on religious ceremonies felt that they must, on Easter, if at no other time, commune. In the council held in the Lateran in Rome in 1215, that which had become a practise was made an obligation, and the twenty-first canon of this council reads thus: "Every believer, of either sex, who has come to years of discretion, must at least once a year confess honestly his sins to his own priest and perform the penance which may be enjoined as far as he is able, and at least on Easter solemnly receive the Eucharist, unless his priest out of sufficient grounds has forbidden its reception. Whoever refuses so to do will be excluded from the Church, and on death be refused Christian burial.' Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. 888.

EASTERN CHURCH.

I. Names, Extent and Branches.
II. History.
General Characterization (§ 1).
Three Periods (§ 2).
Intolerance and Persecution (§ 3).
The Schism between East and West (§ 4).
Points of Difference (§ 5).
Relations to Protestant Churches (§ 6).
III. Doctrine, Polity, and Liturgy.
Creed (§ 1).
Theology (§ 2).
Government (§ 3).
Worship and Ritual (§ 4).
Liturgy of the Lord's Supper (§ 5).
Saints, Relics, and Images. Language of Worship (§ 6).
Monks and Clergy (§ 7).
Religious Life (§ 8).
The Greek Canon (§ 9).
Missions (§ 10).
IV. The Eastern Church in America.

I. Names, Extent, and Branches: Various names are used to designate the great division of Christendom which is considered in this article. The full official title is "the Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church" (*ἡ ἁγία ὀρθόδοξος καθολικὴ ἀποστολικὴ ἀνατολικὴ ἐκκλησία*). The Roman Church claims all these titles, except "Oriental," for which it substitutes "Roman," and claims them exclusively. The name "Eastern (or Oriental) Church" designates its origin and geographical territory. The "Orthodox Church" expresses its close adherence to the ecumenical system of doctrine and discipline as settled by the seven ecumenical councils before the separation from the Western or Latin Church. On this title the chief stress is laid, and it is celebrated on a special day called "Orthodoxy Sunday," in the beginning of Lent, when a dramatic representation of the old ecumenical councils is given in the churches, and anathemas are pronounced on all heresies. The common designation "Greek Church" is not strictly correct, but indicates the national origin of the church and the language in which most of its creeds, liturgies, canons, and theological and ascetic literature are composed, and its worship mainly conducted.

The Eastern Church embraces the Greek, and the Russian and other Slavonic nationalities. It has its seat in Eastern Europe—chiefly in Turkey, Servia, Rumania, Greece, Russia, and some parts of Austria—and in Western Asia. Bulgaria was long a bone of contention between Constantinople and Rome and one of the causes of separation, but is now an independent branch of the "Orthodox" Church, ruled by an exarch (see BULGARIA; BULGARIANS, CONVERSION OF THE). In Western Europe and America there are congregations of merchants and immigrants or connected with embassies (for America, see below, IV.). The total number of adherents of the Eastern Church is about 100,000,000, of whom 85,000,000 belong to the Russian Church. The Eastern Church thus ranks third among the three great divisions of Christendom, the Roman Catholic Church being credited with 230,000,000 adherents, and the Protestant Churches with 140,000,000.

The Eastern Church is divided into at least fifteen branches or parts, each independent of the other. The first rank is held by the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (see CONSTANTINOPLE; PATRIARCH). Then follow (2) Alexandria (see ALEXANDRIA, PATRIARCHATE OF); (3) Antioch; (4) Jerusalem (see JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF); (5) Cyprus (which was recognized as a bishopric by the Council of Ephesus in 431 and includes 160,000 Greek Catholics); (6) Russia (q.v.), (7) Karlowitz (the metropolitan see of the Hungarian Servians); (8) Montenegro (q.v.), (9) the archbishopric of Sinai (independent since 1782); (10) Greece (independent of Constantinople since 1852; see GREECE); (11) the metropolitan see of Hermannstadt (for the Rumanians in Hungary); (12) the exarchate of Bulgaria (since 1870; see BULGARIA); (13) the metropolitan see of Czernowitz (for Bukowina and Dalmatia, including the Ruthenians and other Cisleithanians); (14) Servia (since 1879; see SERVIA); (15) Rumania (since 1885; see RUMANIA). The Georgian Church has been absorbed by the Russian. The Church of Bosnia and Herzegovina (q.v.), with three independent metropolitans, has a loose relation to the ecumenical patriarch. Constantinople, the city of the first Christian emperor, is still the natural center of the whole Eastern Church and may again become, in Christian hands, for the Eastern world what Gregory Nazianzen described it to be in the fourth century, "the eye of the world, the strongest by sea and land, the bond of union between East and West, to which the most distant extremes from all sides come together, and to which they look up as to a common center and emporium of the faith."

II. History: The Eastern Church has no continuous history like the Roman Catholic and the Protestant. It has long periods of monotony and stagnation, and is isolated from the main current of progressive Christendom. Yet this Church represents the oldest tradition in Christendom, and for several centuries was the chief bearer of our religion. It still occupies the sacred territory of primitive Christianity, and claims most of the Apostolic sees, as Jerusalem, Antioch, and the churches founded by Paul and John in Asia Minor and Greece. All the Apostles, with the exception of Peter and Paul, labored and died in the East. From the old Greeks the Church inherited the language and certain national traits of character, while it incorporated also much of Jewish and Oriental piety. It produced the first Christian literature, apologics of the Christian faith, refutations of heresies, commentaries on the Bible, sermons, homilies, and ascetic treatises. The great majority of the early Fathers, and at least some of the Apostles, used the Greek language. Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Cyril of Alexandria, the first Christian emperors beginning with Constantine the Great, together with a host of martyrs and confessors, belong to the Greek communion. It elaborated the ecumenical dogmas of the Trinity and Christology, and ruled the first seven ecumenical councils, which were all held in Constantinople or its immediate neighborhood (Nicæa, Chalcedon, Ephesus). The palmy period

1. General Characterization.

of the Eastern Church during the first five centuries will ever claim the grateful respect of the whole Christian world; and its great teachers still live in their writings far beyond the confines, nay, even more outside of its communion, as the books of Moses and the Prophets are more studied and better understood among Christians than among Jews, for whom they wrote. But the Church has never materially progressed beyond the standpoint occupied in the fifth and sixth centuries. It has no proper middle age, and no Reformation, like Western Christendom. It influences the Churches of the West to-day chiefly through the Nicene and other creeds, its hymns made known by J. M. Neale and others, and the writings and examples of its great theologians, preachers, commentators, and historians of the first five centuries.

2. Three Periods.

Three periods may be distinguished in the history of the Eastern Church: (1) The **Classical** or **Productive** period, the first five or six centuries, has just been characterized. The last great theologian of the East is John of Damascus (d. before 754), who summed up the scattered results of the labors of the preceding Fathers into a tolerably complete system of theology; but he is an isolated phenomenon. The process of degeneracy and stagnation had already set in; and the former life and vigor gave way to idle speculations, distracting controversies, dead formalism, and traditionalism. (2) The **Byzantine** period, corresponding to the Middle Ages of the Latin Church, extends from the rise of Mohammedanism to the fall of Constantinople (650–1453). Here are found the gradual separation from the West and from all progressive movements; dependence on the imperial court at Constantinople; continuation of a certain literary activity; philological and Biblical studies in slavish dependence on the Fathers; commentaries of Œcumenius (c. 990), Theophylact (d. after 1107), Euthymius Zigabenus (d. after 1118); large literary collections, classical and Christian, of Photius (c. 890), Balsamon, Zonaras, Suidas, and Simeon Metaphrastes; the liturgical works of Maximus, Sophronius, Simeon of Thessalonica; the Byzantine historians; the iconoclastic controversy (726–842; see IMAGES AND IMAGE WORSHIP, II); inroads and conquests of Mohammedanism (from 630) in Syria, Persia, Egypt, North Africa; temporary suspension of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem; finally, the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, and the extinction of the Greek Empire (1453), which led to the immigration of Greek scholars (Chalcondylas, Chrysoloras, Gemistos Plethon, Michael Apostolius, Theodore Gaza, George of Trebizond, and others) to the West, the revival of letters, the study of the Greek Testament, and prepared the way for the Reformation. During this period of decline in its original home, the Greek Church made a great conquest in the conversion of the Slavonians (the Bulgarians and Russians) in the ninth and tenth centuries, while the Latin Church was converting the Celtic and Teutonic races. (3) The **Modern** period may be dated from the downfall of the Greek Empire (1453). It presents in Asia stagnation and slavery under the rule of the Turks but great tenacity and independence as to all internal affairs; in Europe, rapid external growth through the rising power of Russia, with some reforms in manners and customs and the introduction of Western culture, protests against Romanizing and evangelical movements, the orthodox confession of Petrus Mogilas (1642), the Synod of Jerusalem (1672), the Russian Church, the patriarchate of Moscow, the reforms of Patriarch Nikon (d. 1681) and of the Czar Peter the Great (d. 1725), the reaction of the Old Believers (Raskolniki), the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg (since 1721), the New Greek Church in Hellas (since 1833), with prospects for the future, depending chiefly on Russia.

3. Intolerance and Persecution.

In the history of the Eastern Church there have been no organized bloody tribunals of orthodoxy like the Spanish Inquisition, no systematic and long-continued persecutions like the crusades against the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Huguenots, and no massacre of St. Bartholomew. But the Greek Church of old mercilessly expelled and exiled Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, and other heretics, and persecuted the Paulicians (835). For centuries none of the Oriental Churches except the Russian has been in a position to exercise jurisdiction over heretics and dissenters, being themselves only tolerated by the Turkish or Egyptian governments. Modern Russia has enforced severe measures against the Stundists and other dissenting bodies and has withheld from Lutherans in the Baltic provinces certain privileges (such as exemption from military service) sacredly promised by the Czar. Secession from the national orthodox Church is rigidly prohibited. No one can be converted in Russia from one religion or sect to another, except to the national orthodox Church; and all the children of mixed marriages, where one parent belongs to it must be baptized and educated in it. The spirit of fanatical intolerance has manifested itself recently in the atrocious persecution of the Jews as it did earlier in 1881; but it would be unfair to hold the Eastern Church responsible for these excesses.

4. The Schism between East and West.

No two Churches are so much alike in their creed, polity and cultus, as the Greek and Roman; and yet no two are such irreconcilable rivals, perhaps for the very reason of their affinity. They agree much more than either agrees with any Protestant Church. They were never organically united. They differed from the beginning in nationality, language, and genius, as the ancient Grecks differed from the Romans; yet they grew up together, and stood shoulder to shoulder in the ancient conflict with paganism and heresy. They cooperated in the early ecumenical councils, and adopted their doctrinal and ritual decisions. But the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople by Diocletian and Constantine, the development of the papal monarchy in the West, and the establishment of a Western empire in connection with it, laid the foundation of a schism which has never been healed. The controversy culminated in the rivalry between the patriarch of Constantinople and the pope of Rome.

The bishop of Constantinople was recognized by the Council of Constantinople in 381 and a place was given him by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 "next after" the bishop of Rome. Leo I. (440–461) protested against the growing assumption of power by the Constantinopolitan bishop, who as early as 500 used the title "ecumenical patriarch." From 484 to 519 the relations between the two bishops were much strained over the Henoticon of Zeno, which sought to soften the Chalcedonian Christological formula (see MONOPHYSITES). The controversy over their relative authority reached an acute stage under Photius and Nicholas I. (qq.v.) who each excommunicated the other (869 and 879). When Ignatius was deposed from the patriarchate of Constantinople and the layman Photius put in his place (857), the latter appealed to Rome for a decision against the Ignatian party. Nicholas sent a commission to investigate and refused to recognize Photius, who then retorted in a famous encyclical letter charging the Roman Church with heresy for the unauthorized insertion of the *filioque* into the Nicene Creed (see FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY) and with various corrupt practises. In 1054 the controversy was renewed under the patriarch Michael Cærularius (q.v.), whom Pope Leo IX. excommunicated as guilty of nine heresies, and it became irreparable through the Venetian conquest of Constantinople (1204) and the establishment of a Latin empire there (1204–61), a Latin patriarch of Constantinople and rival Latin bishops in other Eastern sees by Innocent III. and other popes. Vain attempts at reunion were made from time to time, especially at Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439). The latter was attended by the patriarch and the Byzantine emperor, but its compromise formula was rejected in the East as treason to the orthodox faith (see FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF). With the fall of Constantinople (1453) the political motive for seeking a union with the West ceased. In 1870 the Vatican Council intensified the chief cause of separation by declaring papal absolutism and papal infallibility an article of faith. Leo XIII. in the bull *Præclara gratulationis* of June 20, 1894, directed "to all princes and peoples," expressed the hope of a reunion of Christendom (cf. A. Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, ii., Giessen, 1906, 295 sqq.). The patriarch Anthimos II. replied, Oct. 11, 1895, charging the Roman Church with innovations, such as the *filioque*, the doctrines of the immaculate conception and papal infallibility, baptism by sprinkling, purgatory, etc.

5. Points of Difference.

The points in which the Greek Church differs from the Roman are the following: the single procession of the Holy Spirit (against the *filioque*), which is as far as the Council of Constantinople in 381 went; the equality of the five patriarchs, and the rejection of the papacy as an antichristian innovation and usurpation; the right of the lower clergy (priests and deacons) to marry (though only once); communion in both kinds; trine immersion the only valid form of baptism; the use of the vernacular languages in worship; a number of minor ceremonies, as the use of common or leavened bread in the Eucharist, infant communion, the repetition of holy unction (*εὐχέλαιον*) in sickness, etc.

6. Relations to Protestant Churches.

On the fruitless negotiations for union between the Lutheran and the Greek Church, and the Anglican and the Greek and Russian Churches, cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 50 sqq. and 74 sqq. The Reformation of the sixteenth century had no effect upon the Oriental Church. The reform movement of Cyril Lucar (q.v.) who, as patriarch of Constantinople, attempted to ingraft Calvinism upon the old trunk, failed completely: he was strangled to death, and his body thrown into the Bosphorus (1638); and his doctrines were condemned by synods in 1638, 1643, and 1672 (cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 54 sqq.). In recent times, however, German universities are often frequented by Russian and Greek students; and the works of German scholars have exerted some modifying influence. The Old Catholic movement was followed with interest; and the Old Catholic conferences in Bonn (1874 and 1875) were attended by several dignitaries from Greece and Russia. There has been also considerable intercourse between Greek and Anglican bishops. The Greek Church is not so strongly committed against Protestantism as the Roman, and may therefore learn something from it. [Yet converts to Protestantism from the Roman Catholic Church have been far more numerous than from the Greek Church, and the thought of Roman Catholicism has been influenced by Protestantism far more than the thought of Greek Catholicism. A. H. N.]

III. Doctrine, Polity, and Liturgy: The Eastern Church holds fast to the decrees and canons of the seven ecumenical councils (see COUNCILS AND SYNODS, § 3). Its proper creed is that adopted at Nicæa in 325, enlarged at Constantinople 381, and indorsed at Chalcedon 451, without the Latin *filioque* (see CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED). This creed is the basis of all Greek catechisms and systems of theology, and a regular part of worship. The Greeks have never acknowledged in form the Apostles' Creed, which is of Western origin, nor the Athanasian Creed, which teaches the double procession, and is likewise of Western origin. Besides this ecumenical creed, the Eastern Church acknowledges three subordinate confessions, which define her position against Romanism and Protestantism, namely: (1) The "Orthodox Confession" of Petrus Mogilas (q.v.), metropolitan of Kief (1643), a catechetical exposition of the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the beatitudes, and the decalogue; (2) the "Confession of Dositheos or Eighteen Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem" (1672); and (3) the "Longer Catechism" of Philaret, metropolitan of Moscow, adopted by the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg in 1839 and published in all the languages of Russia. (For text of these creeds and confessions, cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 273–542; and J. Michalcescu, see bibliography below.) [Mention should also be made of the work of Gennadius II. of Constantinople and of Metrophanes Kritopulus (qq.v.), the former of whom wrote a brief document in

1. Creed.

twenty articles, and the latter a confession in twenty-three chapters (given in full by Michalcescu). A. H. N.]

The doctrinal system of the Eastern Church is, upon the whole, more simple and less developed than that of the Roman, though in some respects more subtle and metaphysical. The only serious doctrinal difference is that on the procession of the Holy Spirit (see FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY). The Greek Church holds to the leading principles, but rejects many of the consequences or results of Roman Catholicism. It adheres to the theology of the Greek Fathers down to John of Damascus, and ignores the succeeding scholastic theology of the schoolmen, who completed the Roman system. The Eastern theology remains rigidly in the fragmentary state of the old councils. The resistance to the Western *filioque* implied a protest against further progress both in truth and in error, and meant stagnation, as well as faithful adherence to the venerable Nicene symbol. The Greek theology is most full on the doctrine of God and of Christ, but very defective on the doctrine of man and the order of salvation. The East went into all sorts of theological and Christological subtleties, especially during the long and tedious Monophysite controversies, which found little or no response in the West; but it ignored the Pelagian controversies, the development of the Augustinian and later evangelical theology. It took the most intense interest in the difference between *ousia* and *hypostasis*, the *homoousion* and *homoiousion*, the relations of the persons in the Trinity, the *agennēsia* of the Father, the eternal *gennēsia* of the Son, the eternal *ekporeusis* or "procession" of the Spirit, the *perichōrēsis*, the relation of the two natures in Christ, the Nestorian, Eutychian, Monophysite, and Monothelite heresies, but was never seriously troubled with questions about predestination, vicarious atonement, justification and imputation, conversion and regeneration, faith and good works, merit and demerit, vital union with Christ, and cognate doctrines, which absorbed the attention of Western Christendom. The cause for this difference must be sought in the prevailing metaphysical, rhetorical, and objective character of the Eastern Church,—inherited partly from Asia, partly from Greece—as distinct from the practical, logical, and subjective tendency of the Western Churches, which is derived from the Roman and the Teutonic nationalities. The difference is illustrated as early as the Nicene Creed, with its metaphysical terms about the Son, as compared with the more simple and popular Apostles' Creed, which originated in the West, and is very little used in the East.

2. Theology.

The Greek Church is a patriarchal oligarchy, in distinction from the papal monarchy. The episcopal hierarchy is retained, the papacy rejected. Centralization is unknown in the East. The patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, are equal in rights, though the first has a primacy of honor. The czar of Russia, however, exercises a sort of general protectorate, and may be regarded as a rival to the pope of Rome, but has no authority in matters of doctrine, and can make no organic changes. The Eastern hierarchy resembles the Jewish type. The Greek priest within the veil of the sanctuary is concealed from the eyes of the people; but in social respects he is nearer the people than the Roman priest. He is allowed, and even compelled, to marry once, but forbidden to marry twice. Celibacy is confined to bishops and monks. Absolution is given only in the form of a prayer, "May the Lord absolve thee," instead of the positive form, "I absolve thee." The confessional exists, but in a milder form, with less influence and abuse, than in Romanism. The laity are more independent; and the Russian czar, like the Byzantine emperor of old, is the head of the Church in his dominion. The unction of confirmation is made to symbolize the royal priesthood of every believer. The monastic orders, though including many clergy, are not clerical institutions as the Latin orders have been since the thirteenth century. The community of Athos (q.v.) is a lay corporation with chaplains.

3. Government.

The administration of the churches as developed in the Byzantine Empire is most complicated, and involves, besides the regular clergy, an army of higher and lower ecclesiastical officers, from the first administrator of the church property (ὁ μέγας οἰκονόμος), the superintendent of the sacristy (ὁ σκευοφύλαξ), the chancellor or keeper of ecclesiastical archives (ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ), down to the cleaners of the lamps (οἱ λαμπαδάριοι), and the bearer of the images of saints (ὁ βασταγάριος). These half-clerical officers are divided into two groups,—one on the right, the other on the left: each is subdivided into three classes, and each class has again five persons. Leo Allatius and Heineccius enumerate fifteen officials of the right group, and even more of the left. But many of these offices have either ceased altogether, or retain only a nominal existence.

In worship and ritual the Eastern Church is much like the Roman Catholic, with the celebration of the sacrifice of the mass as its center, with an equal and even greater neglect of the sermon, and is addressed more to the senses and imagination than to the intellect and the heart. It is strongly Oriental, unintelligibly symbolical and mystical, and excessively ritualistic. The Greeks reject organs, musical instruments, and sculpture, and make less use of the fine arts in their churches than the Roman Catholics; but they have even a more complicated system of ceremonies, with gorgeous display, semibarbaric pomp, and endless changes of sacerdotal dress, crossings, gestures, genuflexions, prostrations, washings, processions, which so absorb the attention of the senses, that there is little room left for the intellectual and spiritual worship. They use the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, which is an abridgment of that of St. Basil, yet very lengthy, and contains, with many old and venerable prayers (one of the finest is incorporated in the Anglican liturgy under the name of Chrysostom), later additions from different sources to an excess of liturgical refinement.

4. Worship and Ritual.

The most characteristic features of Greek wor-

ship, as distinct from the Roman, are the threefold immersion in baptism, with the repudiation of any other mode as essentially invalid; the simultaneous performance of the act of confirmation and the act of baptism which in the West have been separated; the anointing with oil in cases of dangerous illness, which Rome has changed into extreme unction of the dying; infant communion, which the Latin Church has not only abandoned, but forbidden; the communion in two kinds; the use of leavened bread in the Eucharist; the standing and eastward posture in prayer; the stricter separation of the sexes; the use of the screen or veil before the altar; and the withdrawal of the performance of the mysteries (sacraments) from the eyes of the people.

5. Liturgy of the Lord's Supper.

The form which the Greek Church developed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper is entirely different from that developed by the Roman Catholic Church. It is symbolical throughout. Not only does one of the antiphonal choirs which perform during the act represent in some mystical way the cherubim, but the whole act is, in its every feature, a symbolical representation of the passion. Five loaves are laid on the altar, each stamped with the sign of the cross and the inscription, "Jesus Christ conquers." The officiating priest selects one of them for the sacrificial lamb; and with a symbolical reference to the soldier who pierced the side of Jesus with a spear, so that blood and water flowed from the wound, he cuts the loaf, by thrusting the holy lance—a knife in the form of a lance—into it, while at the same time the deacon pours the wine and the water into the cup. Under somber dirges the elements are then carried in a solemn procession, headed with many lighted candles and much incense-burning, through the whole church, and back again to the altar, where they are deposited, like the body of Christ in the tomb. A curtain is lowered before the altar; and, unseen by the congregation, the elements are consecrated while the choir is chanting the Lord's Prayer. When the curtain is drawn, the altar represents the tomb from which Christ has risen; and, while the choir sings a hymn of praise, the elements are presented to the communicants without any special formula of distribution. The consecrated bread is broken into the consecrated wine and both elements are given together in a spoon. Greek writers on liturgy claim that this custom (known as *intinction*) dates back to the time of Chrysostom. It never gained foothold in the Western Church, and was forbidden as unscriptural by Pope Julius I. (337–352).

6. Saints, Relics, and Images. Language of Worship.

The worship of saints, relics, flat images, and the cross is carried as far as, or even farther than, in the Roman Church; but statues, bas-reliefs, and crucifixes are forbidden. In Russia especially the veneration for pictures of the Virgin Mary and the saints is carried to the utmost extent, and takes the place of the Protestant veneration for the Bible. The holy picture (icon) with the lamp burning before it is found and worshiped in the corner (the sacred place) of every room, in the street, over gateways, in offices, taverns, steamers, railway and telegraph stations, and is carried in the knapsack of every soldier, not as a work of art, but as an emblem, a means of instruction, an aid to devotion. The vernacular languages are used in worship—the Greek in Turkey and Greece, the Slavonic in Russia; but they have to a considerable extent become unintelligible to the people. The old Slavonic differs from the modern Russian about as much as Chaucer's English from our English. The Oriental sects hold to their native dialects,—the Syriac, Armenian, etc. The old Greek calendar, which is thirteen days behind the new style introduced by Gregory XIII., is still retained.

7. Monks and Clergy.

Christian life has the same general features as in the Roman Catholic Church. The mass of the people are contented with an ordinary morality, while the monks aim at a higher degree of ascetic piety. The monastic system has not developed into great orders, as in the West. There are three classes of monks, the cenobites (*κοινοβιακοί*), who live together in a monastery ruled by an archimandrite who is often a bishop (*ἀρχιμανδρίτης, ἡγούμενος*); the anchorets (*ἀναχωρηταί*), who live in a cell apart from the other monks, or among the laity; and the ascetes (*ἀσκηταί*), or hermits. The monks usually follow the rule of St. Basil; some, the rule of St. Anthony. The bishops are taken from the monks. Important monasteries are at Jerusalem, Mount Athos (q.v.), Mount Sinai (where the celebrated Sinaitic manuscript of the Bible was kept for centuries), and Mar Saba near the Dead Sea. The Greek monks as a rule are more ignorant and superstitious than the Roman Catholic, and the same may be said of the clergy, many of whom are merely mechanical functionaries.

8. Religious Life.

Religious life is supposed to originate in baptismal regeneration, and to be nourished chiefly by the sacraments. Prayer, fasting, and charitable deeds are the principal manifestations of piety. The observance of the Ten Commandments is strictly enjoined in all the catechisms. The Greeks and Russians are very religious in outward observances and devotions, but know little of what Protestants mean by subjective experiential piety, and personal direct communion of the soul with the Savior. The Greek Christians surpass their Mohammedan neighbors in chastity, but are behind them in honesty. What St. Paul says of the Cretans (Titus i. 12) is still characteristic of the race, of course with honorable exceptions. In Russia there is the same divorce between religion and morality. The towns are adorned with churches and convents. Every public event is celebrated by the building of a church. Every house has an altar and sacred pictures; every child his guardian angel and baptismal cross. A Russian fasts every Wednesday and Friday, prays early and late, regularly attends mass, confesses his sins, pays devout respect to sacred places and things, makes pilgrimages to the tombs and shrines of saints, and has the phrase *Slava Boga !* ("Glory to God!") continually on his lips.

Concerning the extent of the canon of the Scriptures, the Eastern Church is not quite consistent, and stands midway between the Roman and the Protestant view concerning the Jewish Apocrypha. The Septuagint is used, which includes the Apocrypha. The Orthodox Confession repeatedly quotes the Apocrypha as authority and the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) mentions several Apocryphal books (The Wisdom of Solomon, Judith, Tobit, the History of Bel and the Dragon, the History of Susanna, the Maccabees, and the Wisdom of Sirach) as parts of the Holy Scriptures. On the other hand, Metrophanes enumerates only twenty-two books of the Old Testament (according to the division of Josephus; see CANON OF SCRIPTURE, I, 4, § 3), and eleven books of the New Testament (counting fourteen Epistles of Paul, the two Epistles of Peter, and the three of John as each one book), and then speaks of the Jewish Apocrypha as not being received by the Church among the canonical and authentic books, and hence not to be used in proof of dogmas. The "Longer Catechism" of Philaret likewise enumerates only twenty-two books of the Old Testament, but twenty-seven books of the New, and says that "the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach and certain other books" are ignored in the list of the books of the Old Testament, "because they do not exist in the Hebrew." The use of the Apocryphal books is justified because "they have been appointed by the Fathers to be read by proselytes who are preparing for admission into the Church."

9. The Greek Canon.

The circulation of the Scriptures among the laity is not encouraged, and certain portions, especially of the Old Testament, are declared to be unfit for general use. But the Greek Church has never prohibited the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue; and the Orthodox Church of Russia has always had a popular version of the Bible, first in the old Slavic, and now in modern Russian. The printing and circulating of the Bible in the Russian language and within the Orthodox Greek Church is under the exclusive control of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg. See BIBLE VERSIONS, XVI.

10. Missions.

The Eastern Church has spread, through Russian influence, in Siberia, the Aleutian Islands, and wherever the civil and military power of the Czar has prepared the way; but, apart from the aid of government, it has little or no missionary spirit, and is content to keep its own. Its greatest mission-work was the conversion of Russia; and this was effected, not so much by preaching as by the marriage of a Byzantine princess and the despotic order of the ruler Vladimir (see RUSSIA). In the midst of the Mohammedan East the Greek populations remain like islands in the barren sea; and the Bedouin tribes have wandered for twelve centuries round the Greek convent of Mount Sinai, probably without one instance of conversion to the creed of men whom they yet acknowledge with almost religious veneration as beings from a higher world.

(PHILIP SCHAFF†) D. S. SCHAFF.

IV. The Eastern Church in America: The Greek Orthodox Church in present United States territory dates from 1794, when nine Russian missionaries arrived at St. Paul on Kadiak Island, Alaska, led by Archimandrite Joasaph Bogoloff. There the first Russian church and school in America were erected. In 1796 an episcopal see was founded and Joasaph was consecrated at Irkutsk in Siberia to be the first bishop of Kadiak, Kamchatka, and America. In 1840 four churches and eight chapels in Russian America were consolidated into an independent diocese and Ivan Veniaminof, who had labored in Alaska as missionary and priest with self-sacrificing zeal and marked success since 1823, was made bishop with the name of Innocent. He provided an Aleutian alphabet and grammar, translated the Gospels, a catechism, and other religious literature into the Aleutian tongue and the language of the Koloshes, living in the vicinity of Sitka, built the cathedral in Sitka, and established a seminary there, where many of the priests and readers now officiating in Alaska have received their education. His influence with the natives was great. In 1855 he removed to Siberia and became archbishop of Kamchatka in 1858. He was made metropolitan of Moscow after the death of Philaret (1867), and died, greatly revered throughout Russia, in 1879. Yakof Netzvetof, a half-breed priest, translated Veniaminof's version of the Gospels and catechism into the Atkha language. After the cession of Russian America to the United States, the bishop of Alaska undertook the oversight of all Slav Orthodox communities in the country, and in 1872 under Bishop John, the episcopal residence was transferred from Sitka to San Francisco. After the death of Bishop Nestor, who was drowned while traveling in performance of his episcopal duties in 1882, the mission of the Russian Church was governed by the ecclesiastical Consistory of San Francisco until 1888, when Bishop Vladimir arrived from Russia. His successors have been Nicholas (1891–98), Tikhon (1898–1907), and the present Archbishop Platon.

The increase of Greek Orthodox communities in the United States has been particularly great since 1888 owing to the immigration of Austrian Slavonians. There are at present 152 churches and chapels in the United States, Alaska, and Canada under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Russia, with one archbishop (since 1905) residing in New York, two bishops—one for Alaska residing at Sitka, the other (since 1904) for Orthodox Syrians residing in Brooklyn,—and an administrator for the Servians. There are seventy-five priests, a seminary at Minneapolis, and 46,000 registered parishioners. An official organ is published in New York in Russian and English. A religious paper formerly published in Chicago in Servian has been discontinued. The Russian cathedral in New York City was dedicated in 1902. In 1906 Archbishop Tikhon introduced Sunday evening services in English in this church. Bishop Innocent of Alaska also favors the substitution of English for the Slavonic service for the Orthodox natives of his jurisdiction.

Orthodox congregations in the United States for those of Syrian nationality date from 1895, when the Russian Bishop Nicholas brought with

him the Very Rev. Archimandrite Raphael Hawaweeny and founded a church for Orthodox Syrians in New York City. In 1899 the congregation acquired permanent quarters in Brooklyn. In 1904 the patriarch of Antioch elevated Raphael to the rank of bishop and he was consecrated by the Russian bishops Tikhon and Innocent, his consecration being the first in the United States of a bishop of the Eastern Church. There are ten churches under his jurisdiction and the membership of his flock is about 45,000.

The first Orthodox church for those of Greek nationality was founded in New Orleans, where many Greek merchants were engaged in the cotton trade. The second was founded in Chicago in 1872, when Greeks and Slavs united in calling a Greek priest from Russia. This church, after an interval, was reestablished in 1891, and in the same year another was opened in New York City, and a fourth in Boston with a priest of Syrian nationality. The Church of Lowell, Mass., a city having a large Greek population, dates from 1895. The total number of Orthodox churches for those of Greek descent, under the jurisdiction either of the Synod of Greece or of the Greek patriarch at Constantinople at present exceeds thirty. A religious paper is published in Greek at Milwaukee. In 1905 and again in 1907 a bill was introduced in the Greek parliament at Athens for the despatch of one of the prelates of Greece as a resident bishop for the Greeks in the United States. The bill, however, failed to pass, perhaps because the existence in the United States of bishops of the Greek Church owing allegiance to two different autonomous synods—those of Russia and Greece—would be anticanonical. It has been suggested that, besides the Russian and Syrian bishops, a Greek and a Servian bishop be appointed; an independent synod for the United States and Canada can then be formed and the bishops can elect their own metropolitan.

The total number of Greek Orthodox inhabitants of the United States, Alaska, and Canada is believed to exceed 300,000. The growth of the churches has been due in no small degree to a tendency on the part of Austrian and Hungarian Uniates who have emigrated to America to separate from Rome and return to the Eastern Orthodox confession. One reason for this tendency is the effort of the Roman Church to deprive the Uniates in America of their married priests. A. A. Stamouli.

Bibliography: The chief sources for the earlier history are the first seven councils, the writings of the Greek Fathers, especially of Athanasius, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, and Photius. For a conspectus of the literature of the Church, consult Krumbacher, *Geschichte*. On the general history consult: J. M Neale, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, London, 1850; J. M. Heineccius, *Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1711; M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 3 vols., Paris, 1740; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, London, 1861, new issue, 1908; A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *L'Empire des tsars et les Russes*, vol. iii., *La Religion*, Paris, 1889; A. H. Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, London, 1899; idem, *Student's Hist. of the Greek Church*, ib. 1902; K. Beth, *Die orientalische Christenheit der Mittelmeerländer*, Berlin, 1902; J. Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine, 527–847*, Paris, 1905; A. Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, London, 1905 (by a Roman Catholic); F. G. Cole, *Mother of All Churches; a brief and comprehensive Handbook of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church*, ib. 1908; the histories of the Councils by Harduin, Mansi, and Hefele; the Church Histories of Hergenröther-Kirsch, Funk, Hefele-Knöppfler, and K. Müller.

On the great schism and the attempts to heal it consult: G. B. Howard, *The Schism between the Oriental and Western Churches*, London, 1892; Leo Allatius, *De ecclesiæ occidentalis et orientalis perpetua consensione*, Cologne, 1648; C. Will, *Acta et scripta . . de controversiis ecclesiæ Græcæ et Latinæ*, Marburg, 1861; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, 2 vols., Munich, 1864–65; J. Hergenröther, *Photius*, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1867–69; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1868–69; L. Duchesne, *Autonomes ecclésiastiques; églises séparées*, Paris, 1896; Eng. transl., *Churches Separated from Rome*, New York, 1908; L. Brehier, *Le Schisme oriental du xi. siècle*, ib. 1899; W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903.

For the formalized symbolics of the Church consult: Schaff, *Creeds*, vols. i.–ii.; E. J. Kimmel, *Monumenta fidei ecclesiæ orientalis*, 2 vols., Jena, 1850; J. B. Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici Græcorum historia et monumenta*, 2 vols., Rome, 1864–68; W. Gass, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche*, Berlin, 1872; F. Kattenbusch, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde*, vol. i., Freiburg, 1892; E. F. K. Müller, *Symbolik*, pp. 195–242, Leipsic, 1896; N. Milas, *Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche*, Zara, 1897; *Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church*, Eng. transl. by P. Lodvill, London, 1898; *Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, . 1672*, Eng. transl. by J. N. W. B. Robertson, London, 1899; F. Loofs, *Symbolik*, i. 2, pp. 109–169, Tübingen, 1902; J. Michalcescu, *Die Bekenntnisse und die wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der griechisch-orientalischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1904 (contains the statements of the first seven councils, and the confessions of Gennadius, Mogilas, Dositheus etc.). The Longer Catechism of Philaret, issued by authority of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg, 1839, is used in the churches and schools of the Russian empire, and is the best modern exposition of the doctrine of the Eastern Church.

On the liturgics consult: H. A. Daniel, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiæ universalis*, vol. iv., Leipsic, 1853; J. Goar, *Euchologium, sive rituale Græcum*, Paris, 1647; E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, 2 vols., Paris, 1716, Eng. transl., *Collection of the Principal Liturgies . . Used by the Greeks . . of the Oriental Church*, Dublin, 1822; J. King, *Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, London, 1872; *The Offices of the Oriental Church, with Historical Introduction*, ed. N. Bjerring, New York, 1884; *Synopsis, or Spiritual Collection of the Daily Prayers, Liturgy, of the Greek Orthodox Church of the East*, transl. and ed. Katherine Lady Lechmere, London (1890); C. E. Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, ed. F. E. Brightman, vol. i., Oxford, 1896; A. Staerk, *Der Taufritus in der griechisch-russischen Kirche*, Freiburg, 1903.

On the more modern history and that of the different branches much material is found in the *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, vols. i. sqq., 1896 sqq.; in *Echos d'orient*, vols. i.–vi.; and in the *Revue internationale de théologie*, vols. iii.–iv., Bern, 1895–96. Consult further: J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen*, pp. 156 sqq., Munich, 1861; Eng. transl., *The Church and the Churches*, London, 1862; idem, *Ueber die Wiedereinigung der christlichen Kirchen*, ib. 1888; L. Boissard, *L'Église de Russie*, 2 vols., Paris, 1867; A. d'Avril, *La Bulgarie chrétienne*, Paris, 1892; idem, *Les Églises autonomes et autocéphales*, ib. 1895; idem, *La Serbie chrétienne*, ib. 1897; H. Gelzer, *Geistliches und Weltliches aus dem türkischen Orient*, Leipsic, 1900; O. Hübner, *Statistische Tabelle aller Länder*, Frankfort, 1901; D. Kyriakos, *Geschichte der orientalischen Kirchen, 1453–1898*, Leipsic, 1902; M. G. Dampier, *Hist. of the Orthodox Church in Austria-Hungary*, London, 1905. Material of value will be found also in D. M. Wallace, *Russia*, New York, 1905.

Special topics are treated in: A. de Stourdza, *Considérations sur la doctrine et l'esprit de l'église orthodoxe*, Paris, 1816; K. P. Pobedonoszew, *Streitfragen der Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1897; K. Boll, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchthum*, Leipsic, 1898; P. Meyer, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche im 16. Jahrhundert*, ib. 1899; A. Schmidtke, *Das Klosterland des Athos*, ib. 1903; B. Pick, *Hymns and Poetry of the Eastern Church*, New York, 1908.

EATON, ARTHUR WENTWORTH HAMILTON: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Kentville, Nova Scotia, Dec. 10, 1849. He was educated at Harvard College (A.B., 1880), and was ordered deacon in 1884 and ordained priest in the following year. After being rector of St. Andrew's, Chestnut Hill, Mass. (1885–86), he spent two years in Europe, and since 1888 has been head of the department of English literature in the Cutler School, New York City. In theology he is a Broad-churchman of the Maurice and Phillips Brooks type. He has written *The Heart of the Creeds; Historical Religion in the Light of Modern Thought* (New York, 1888); *Acadian Legends and Lyrics* (1889); *The Church of England in Nova Scotia and the Tory Clergy of the Revolution* (1891); *Tales of a Garrison Town* (in collaboration with C. L. Betts; 1892); *Acadian Ballads* (New York, 1905); and *Poems of the Christian Year* (1905). He has also edited several works of English literature.

EBED JESU, î'bed jî'sū: Nestorian theologian; b. in Mesopotamia about the middle of the thirteenth century; d. at Nisibis, in Armenia, Nov., 1318. He became bishop of Sinjar (60 m. w. of Mosul) about 1285, and in 1291 metropolitan of Nisibis. His importance is principally of a literary character, since he is regarded as the last great writer of the Nestorians. The most important of his works is the metrical "Catalogue" of Syriac authors, in which in four books he treats of the writings of the Old and the New Testament, of translations from the Greek into Syriac, and of works originally written in Syriac, especially Nestorian productions. Other works of note are "The Pearl," a dogmatic work, in five parts; the *Nomocanon*, a collection of the canons of synods; and *Paradisus Eden*, a collection of poems. Other works have been lost.

The name is frequent among the Syrians, and is pronounced by them Abdisho or Odisho. A martyr of this name is referred to in H. Feige's *Geschichte des Mar Abhdiso* (Kiel, 1889), while a bishop of the name, a convert to Romanism, was present at the last session of the Council of Trent and is pictured at the entrance to the Sistine Chapel at Rome (cf. G. E. Khayyath, *Syri orientales*, p. 124, Rome, 1870). E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The "Catalogue" was edited by Abraham Ecchellensis, Rome, 1653; by J. S. Asseman, with Latin transl. and commentary, in *Bibliotheca orientalis*, iii. 1, pp. 1–362, Rome, 1728; an Eng. transl. appears in Appendix A of G. P. Badger's *Nestorians and their Ritual*, ii. 361–379, London, 1852, which contains also a transl. of "The Pearl," ii. 380 sqq.; "The Pearl" is also in A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, ii. 317 sqq., 10 vols., Rome, 1825–38, where (pp. 169 sqq.) will be found also the *Nomocanon*. The poems were edited by H. Gismondi at Beirut, 1888 (cf. Nöldeke in *ZDMG*, 1889, xliii. 675, and Zingerle, in the same, 1875, xxix. 496). Consult: W. Wright, *A Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, pp. 285 sqq., London, 1894; R. Duval, *La Littérature syriaque*, Paris, 1900.

EBEL, ê'bel, **JOHANN WILHELM:** German preacher; b. at Passenheim (75 m. s.s.e. of Königsberg), East Prussia, Mar. 4, 1784; d. at Hoheneck, near Ludwigsburg (9 m. n. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Aug. 18, 1861. After his graduation at Königsberg, he became acquainted with Johann Heinrich Schönherr (q.v.), and espoused his views of relative dualism. His pronounced evangelical views, and eloquent advocacy of practical Christianity, were distasteful to the rationalistic and dead orthodox clergy of the province, who tried, from the beginning of his ministerial career at Hermsdorf (1807–09), to awe him into submission, and, upon his removal to Königsberg as preacher and teacher (1810), resented his growing popularity by charging him with heresy. The charge, however, was dismissed as unfounded, while Ebel was chosen preacher of the Old Town Church at Königsberg, the largest in the city, in 1816, and filled that high position until his deprivation in 1842.

In 1826 a ministerial rescript, directed against mysticism, Pietism, and separatism, was eagerly seized by Schön, the provincial governor, an unchristian and unprincipled man, and other opponents of Ebel and Heinrich Diestel, his brother minister and friend, as an opportunity for the trumped-up charge of having founded a sect which held secret meetings and advocated tenets of perilous and immoral tendency. The consistory decided the case against the accused, and, in 1835, arbitrarily and illegally suspended them *ab officio*. On appeal the action of the consistory was canceled, but Ebel, though acquitted of the charge of having founded a sect, was not reinstated, on the alleged ground of neglect of duty. The prosecution, originating in theological hatred, took place at a time when the judicial process in Prussia was still private. To-day it would be impossible to bring such a case to the cognizance of a jury. After his deprivation, Ebel lived at Grünefeld (1842–48), at Meran in the Tyrol (1848–50), and at Hoheneck (1850–61). J. I. MOMBERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The most important of the works of Ebel are: *Die Weisheit von Oben*, Königsberg, 1823; *Gedeihliche Erziehung*, Hamburg, 1825; *Die apostolische Predigt ist zeitgemäss*, Hamburg, 1835; *Die Treue*, Königsberg, 1835; *Verstand und Vernunft* (in company with G. H. Diestel), Leipsic, 1837; *Zeugniss der Wahrheit* (by the same), ib. 1838; *Grundzüge der Erkenntniss der Wahrheit*, ib. 1852; *Die Philosophie der heiligen Urkunde des Christenthums*, Stuttgart, 1854–56. For his life consult: J. I. Mombert, *Faith Victorious, being an Account of the Life and Labours and of the Times of J. Ebel*, London, 1882; H. Wagener, *Ueber J. W. Ebel*, Ludwigsburg, 1861. Consult also: E. Hahnenfeld, *Die religiöse Bewegung zu Königsberg*, Braunsberg, 1858; E. Kanitz, *Aufklärung nach Actenquellen über den Königsberger (1835–42)*, *Religionsprozess*, Basel, 1862; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xxvi., 1869.

EBER. See TABLE OF THE NATIONS.

EBER, ê'ber, **PAUL:** German theologian and Reformer; b. at Kitzingen (11 m. e.s.e. of Würzburg) Nov. 8, 1511; d. at Wittenberg Dec. 10, 1569. He received his first education at home, and attended the schools of Nuremberg, then entered the University of Wittenberg on June 1, 1532, where his teachers were Luther and Melanchthon, and in 1537 was made a member of the faculty, being appointed regular professor four years later, first of Latin and then of physics. His lectures comprised the wide range of the liberal arts, although his chief attention was devoted to Latin, history, natural science, and even to anatomy. A versatile literary activity was the result. With the aid of Melanchthon he wrote his *Contexta populi Judaici historia*

a reditu ex Babylonico exilio usque ad ultimum excidium Hierosolymæ (Wittenberg, 1548), and with Kasper Peucer he prepared his *Vocabula rei nummariæ volucrum et piscium appellationes* (1549). His most famous work is his *Calendarium historicum* (1550), written in collaboration with Melanchthon and containing a reformed calendar of the saints with a historical calendar.

Eber's firm attitude during the Schmalkald War of 1546–47 won him the admiration of his colleagues, and on June 21, 1557, he succeeded Johann Forster as professor of the Old Testament and preacher at the *Schlosskirche*. He accompanied Melanchthon to the Colloquy of Worms and acted as secretary, but returned from Worms at Christmas, and succeeded Bugenhagen as municipal preacher and general superintendent of the electoral circuit, Sept. 4, 1558. When Melanchthon died in 1560, his course of lectures was completed by Eber, who, as professor of the Old Testament, was invited by the Elector August to revise the Vulgate of the Old Testament for the *Biblia Germanico-Latina* (1565). He was obliged, however, to complete his work in a year and a half, and he was little pleased with his results. As a preacher he is best known by two volumes published after his death by his pupils, the *Evangeliorum dominicalium explicatio* (ed. J. Cellarius, Frankfort, 1576) and the *Katechismuspredigten* (ed. T. Feurelius, Nuremberg, 1577). His most bitter struggles were connected with the controversies on the nature of the Eucharist. Like Melanchthon, he rejected the ubiquitarianism of Brenz, and frequently approximated the Calvinistic view. Peucer later said in reproach of him that he had been convinced of the truth of the Swiss doctrine as early as 1561, but had suddenly become an opponent of the crypto-Calvinists of Wittenberg after the Dresden conference of Mar. 25, 1561. It is indisputable that on that occasion he advocated a confession which harked back to the Wittenberg Concordia, and henceforth taught a modified Lutheranism which he regarded as the true interpretation of the Augsburg Confession, defending his views in his *Vom heiligen Sakrament des Leibs und Bluts unsers Herrn Jesu Christi* (Wittenberg, 1562), although his course contented neither the Lutherans nor the Reformed. Eber is also famous as an author of hymns, of which the best-known are *Herr Jesu Christ, wahr'r Mensch und Gott* ("Lord Jesus Christ, true Man and God") and *Wenn wir in höchsten Nöthen sein* ("When in the hour of utmost need").

(G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources of value for a life are in *CR*, iii.–ix., and in J. Voigt, *Briefwechsel der berühmtesten Gelehrten mit Herzog Albrecht*, pp. 234 sqq., Königsberg, 1841. Consult also: C. H. Sixt, *Dr. Paul Eber*, Heidelberg, 1843; idem, *Paul Eber. Ein Stück Wittenberger Lebens*, Ansbach, 1857; T. Pressel, in *Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter . der lutherischen Kirche*, vol. viii., Elberfeld, 1862, G. Buchwald, *Paul Eber*, Leipsic, 1897; J. W. Richard, *Philip Melanchthon*, passim, New York, 1898; Julian, *Hymnology*, 318, 9.

EBERHARD, ê'ber-hārd, OF BÉTHUNE: French grammarian and theologian; b. at Béthune (20 m. s.w. of Lille); flourished between 1100 and 1200. Of his life almost nothing is known, except that he was the author of two important works. The first of these is his *Græcismus de figuris et octo partibus orationis*, a poem of more than 2,000 verses, treating of rhetoric, prosody, grammar, and syntax, the whole without any logical arrangement. It was first edited by J. H. Metulinus (Paris, 1487). As a theologian Eberhard distinguished himself by his *Liber antihæresis*, in which he assailed the Cathari, then numerous in Flanders. This work is important as a source for the teachings of this sect. It was first edited by J. Gretser in his *Trias scriptorum contra Waldenses* (Ingolstadt, 1614), and contains two appendices, one a catalogue of older heresies, drawn from the *Origines* of Isidore of Seville, and the other a polemic against the Jews. A number of unimportant treatises, including the *Labarintus*, a poem on poetry, rhetoric, and grammar, are erroneously ascribed to this Eberhard.

(C. SCHMIDT†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources of information are indicated in U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, Paris, 1883. Consult J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina*, ii. 218, Hamburg, 1734; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xvii. 129.

EBERLIN, JOHANN: One of the most important popular writers of the time of the Reformation; b. at Günzburg (30 m. w.n.w. of Augsburg), Bavaria, c. 1465; d. at Wertheim (20 m. w. of Würzburg), Baden, c. 1530. His youth is obscure. He was already priest of the diocese of Augsburg when he was matriculated at Basel in 1489. Here he became master of arts, and later entered the monastery of the Franciscans at Heilbronn. In the second decade of the sixteenth century he entered the monastery of Tübingen, developing a remarkable activity as a preacher in the town and its neighborhood, where he became involved in disputes with the theologians of the University of Tübingen. Subsequently he went to Ulm and in 1520 seems to have been in the monastery of the Franciscans at Freiburg in the Breisgau where he became acquainted with Luther's works, which he studied with great zeal. The result of his studies showed itself in his Lent-sermons, preached in Ulm after his return to that city, as a consequence of which he was persecuted and compelled to leave (1521). At this time he conceived the plan of writing a cycle of popular works under the title *Fünfzehn Bundesgenossen*, in which fifteen prominent people should give utterance to the wrongs of the nation, one after the other expressing his opinion in a special treatise. The work appeared at Basel, 1521, and shows the influence of Luther. Eberlin's propositions of reform were most radical; his main attacks were directed against monastic affairs, but he touches almost every question of ecclesiastical, religious and social life. In the later *Bundesgenossen* Eberlin was influenced by the radical tendencies of Carlstadt, and his ideas undoubtedly contributed to the revolutionary tendencies of the lower classes which found expression in the Peasants' War. Eberlin shows himself in this work a popular writer of the first rank, original and striking in his way of treating matters in popular and blunt language. Friend and foe testify to the great sensation caused by this collection of treatises. In the mean time Eberlin had gone north. After a short stay at Leipsic he went to Wittenberg

where like many older men he became a student at the University (1522). Under the immediate influence of Luther and Melanchthon his radicalism sobered down, as appears from his treatise *Vom Misbrauch christlicher Freiheit* (1522) and from later writings in which he recalled not a few of his former demands. In 1523 he visited the South and preached at Basel, Rheinfelden, Rottenburg-on-the-Neckar and Ulm, returning before the close of the year to Wittenberg. In the spring of 1524 he went to Erfurt where he received a position as preacher, but lost it in the following year in the disturbances caused by the Peasants' War. Afterward he found a permanent position as first preacher of Count George II. of Wertheim, which he held until his death. Besides the works mentioned Eberlin wrote a famous tract entitled *Mich wundert, dass kein Geld im Lande ist* in which he tried to show the causes of impoverishment and advocated honest and dignified labor, and *Wie sich ein Diener Gottes Worts in all seinem Thun halten soll* (1525), a kind of pastoral theology highly esteemed by August Hermann Francke. (T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: Selected writings of Eberlin, ed. L. Enders, are in *Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke*, nos. 139–141, Halle, 1896. Consult: B. Riggenbach, *J. Eberlin und sein Reformprogramm*, Tübingen, 1874 (cf. W. Schum, in *GGA*, 1875, pp. 801–802); M. Radlkofer, *J. Eberlin und Hans Jacob Wehe*, Nördlingen, 1887.

EBERSDORF BIBLE. See Bibles, Annotated, and Bible Summaries, I., § 3.

EBIONITES: The name applied first to Christians in general, then to Jewish Christians, and finally to heretical Jewish Christians. To Jewish Christians this name was given because they were generally poor (Hebr. *ebyon, ebyonim*); and this poverty, especially characteristic of the Christians of Jerusalem evoked from the pagan world for the whole sect the contemptuous appellation "the poor" (cf. Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, xxxvi.). Subsequently its application was limited to Jewish Christians (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 1). When a portion of the Jewish Church became separate and heretical, the designation marked this division exclusively. In the fourth century Epiphanius, Jerome and Theodoret used it of a separate party within the Jewish Church distinct from the Nazarenes. Many of the fathers derived the term from a supposed founder of the sect called Ebion (Hippolytus, *Philosophoumena*, vii. 34; Tertullian, *Hær.*, xxxiii.; *De carne Christi*, xiv.; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxx. 1), said to have lived at Pella after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Early Use of the Name.

The sources for the history of Ebionism, or of Jewish Christianity, are very meager. Neither the New Testament nor the extracanonical literature know of any writings coming directly from them. The notices in the early fathers are confused; those in later fathers like Epiphanius and Jerome belong to too late a time to justify inferences as to an earlier existence. Several of the fathers give a picture of the Jewish Christians of their times as it was presented to them and according to their subjective interests.

The doctrinal position in Jewish Christianity was not such as to produce different sects. A stronger contrast existed only between ordinary Jewish Christianity and syncretistic Gnostic Christianity, while the former divides into a milder and a stricter party. In the New Testament three groups are apparent. The heretics of the Epistle to the Colossians prefigure Gnostic Jewish Christians; the Christians called Ebionites by Epiphanius appear in the New Testament as those who observed the Mosaic law, but did not make it binding upon Gentile Christians. Besides these there were the Pharisaic Jewish Christians, who insisted upon the observance of the Mosaic law and of circumcision by all, and rejected Paul as a false apostle. Both the latter parties were known to Justin (*Trypho*, xlvii.). Between the time of Justin and Irenæus the complete separation of Jewish Christianity must have been consummated. Irenæus described the Ebionites as Jewish Christians who insisted upon the observance of the whole Jewish law, rejected Paul as a heretic and used only the Gospel of Matthew. Their teaching agreed with that of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, denying the virgin-birth, and regarding Jesus as a mere man.

Three Groups Mentioned or Implied.

While the importance of observance of the Jewish law was diminishing, the Christological question became crucial. To regard Christ as mere man was considered specifically Ebionitic. Origen (*Contra Celsum*, v. 61) distinguished between two branches of Ebionites, those who denied and those who accepted the miraculous birth, but says of both that they rejected the epistles of Paul (*Contra Celsum*, i. 65). Those two groups of Ebionites dwelling in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea had little influence upon the nascent Catholic Church. The case was different with the third group, the syncretistic Gnostic Jewish Christians, whom alone Epiphanius calls Ebionites, though he knew other parties related to them. Those Ebionites represented a syncretistic Judaism which combined theosophic speculation with ascetic tendencies. Heathenish elements derived from Asiatic religions were combined with Jewish monotheism; the Old Testament became an object of criticism and parts were eliminated, angelic powers played a great part. That type of Judaism, in absorbing Christian elements, became a syncretistic Jewish Christianity. Jesus was only a man upon whom descended the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove at his baptism, whereby he became a prophet. Circumcision and daily ablutions were regarded important; sacrifices were rejected; and the Old Testament was acknowledged only in part. Christianity was a purified Mosaism; Paul was opposed and rejected. See Elkesaites.

Christology the Distinguishing Doctrine.

(G. Uhlhorn†.)

Bibliography: The sources are indicated in the text in the writings of Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Hegesippus, and Origen. Collections of sources more or less complete and of later literature are made in A. Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, pp. 362–522, Hamburg, 1844; A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche*, pp. 152 sqq., Bonn, 1857; A. Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra canonem*, Leipsic, 1866. Consult: J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, Dissertation iii., London, 1890; G. Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionen des*

Clemens Romanus, pp. 383 sqq., Göttingen, 1854; D. Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, 2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1856; A. Hilgenfeld, *Judenthum und Judenchristenthum*, Leipsic, 1886; T. Zahn, *Kanon*, II. ii. 624 sqq., ib. 1891; Harnack, *Litteratur*, I. i. 625 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 344–364 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 428–432; *DCB*, ii. 24–28.

EBNER, êb'ner, CHRISTINA: Prioress of Engelthal, near Nuremberg; b. at Nuremberg Mar. 28, 1277; d. at Engelthal Dec. 27, 1356. She was the daughter of a Nuremberg patrician. In 1289 she entered the convent of Engelthal, whence the fame of her holiness spread as early as 1297; in 1345 she became prioress. She lived for many years an ascetic life and had visions and inner experiences which have been preserved in her own records and those of her confessor, the Dominican Conrad von Füssen. In her biographies of deceased sisters she introduces a circle of God-seeking women who had been filled with the spirit of mysticism. Christina's spiritual memoirs relate the events of the time and thus offer material useful for the historian. She also wrote on earthquakes and the Black Death (1348). The last days of her life were enlivened by a visit of Henry of Nördlingen (1351), whose congenial thought and feeling confirmed her inner life. Her memoirs are written in noble and at times poetical language and show a woman deeply in earnest and of fine taste and education. (PHILIPP STRAUCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. W. K. Lochner, *Leben und Geschichte der Christina Ebnerin*, Nuremberg, 1872; K. Schröder, *Der Nonne von Engelthal Büchlein Von der Genaden Ueberlast*, Tübingen, 1871; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, i. 223–224, 8th ed., London [1905].

EBNER, MARGARETA: Fourteenth century mystic; b. at Donauwörth (25 m. n. of Augsburg) c. 1291; d. at the convent of Maria Medingen near Dillingen (23 m. n.w. of Augsburg) June 20, 1351. She is not related to Christina Ebner, but descended from a patrician family at Donauwörth and entered the monastery of Dominican nuns at Maria Medingen. On account of a lingering disease she retired from 1312 to 1315 more and more into herself and soon experienced supposed proofs of divine grace, but her life received its decisive tendency only in 1332 by her intercourse with Henry of Nördlingen (q.v.). In her diaries she has related the story of her sufferings and visions, and of her spiritual intercourse with Henry of Nördlingen. Her style lacks variety and a higher flight of thought. Like Christina, she touches historical events of the time. She was highly respected, not only in Medingen, but men like Tauler sought her acquaintance and entered into correspondence with her. (PHILIPP STRAUCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Strauch, *Margareta Ebner und Heinrich von Nördlingen*, Tübingen, 1882; W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik*, ii. 247–251, 269–274, 277–306, Leipsic, 1881; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, i. 216, 8th ed., London [1905].

EBO (EBBO): Archbishop of Reims and bishop of Hildesheim; b. on a Frankish crown estate east of the Rhine toward the end of the eighth century; d. at Hildesheim Mar. 20, 851. His father was a serf, but he was educated in Charlemagne's court school and became the youthful friend of the subsequent Emperor Louis, who elevated him in 816 to the archbishopric of Reims. In 823 he led a great Frankish mission to Denmark, and was appointed by the Pope apostolic legate in the North. From Sleswick, where he first gained a firm footing, he penetrated heathendom, liberated many Christian captives from slavery, founded a cloister in Holstein, and thus paved the way for Denmark's transition to Christianity. In the partizanships and contentions about the throne which subsequently disordered the Empire, he took sides with the opponents of the Emperor Louis, interested himself in the latter's humiliation, and was rewarded therefor by Lothair with the opulent abbey of St. Vedast in Arras. When Louis proved victorious, Ebo was dispossessed of all his offices and honors at the Synod of Diedenhofen in 835, and was kept under guard as prisoner of state in the abbey of Fulda. Only after Louis' death did he regain his freedom and return to Reims. Soon after, being banished again by Charles the Bald, he fled to Italy, till Louis the German recalled him and rewarded him with the bishopric of Hildesheim. Here he still wrought for a short time in peace. Two small writings are attributed to Ebo: *Indiculum de ministris Remensis ecclesiæ*, and *Apologia archiepiscopi Remensis cum ejusdem ad gentes septentrionales legatione* (Bouquet, *Recueil*, vi. 254 sqq., vii. 277 sqq.). He has been suggested as the possible author or instigator of the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals (q.v.). A. WERNER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis ecclesiæ*, ii. 19–20, ed. G. Waitz, in *MGH, Script.*, xiii (1881), 467 sqq.; A. Simson, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reichs*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1874; G. Dehio, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Hamburg-Bremen*, Berlin, 1877; H. Schrörs, *Hinkmar*, Freiburg, 1884; E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reichs*, Leipsic, 1887; Hauck, *KD*, ii. passim; *KL*, iv. 92–94.

EBRARD OF BÉTHUNE. See EBERHARD.

EBRARD, ê'brärt, JOHANN HEINRICH AUGUST.

Student Life and Early Lectures (§ 1).
Professor at Zurich and Erlangen (§ 2).
Councilor of the Consistory (§ 3).
The New Catechism and Hymn-book (§ 4).
Victory of Ebrard's Opponents (§ 5).
His Return to Erlangen (§ 6).
Estimate of his Work (§ 7).

This Reformed theologian was born at Erlangen Jan. 18, 1818; d. there July 23, 1888. His father came of a family of French refugees and was preacher of the French Reformed Church in Erlangen. At an early age August revealed extraordinary endowments and vivacity of mind. He attended the gymnasium of his native city, and began the study of theology at the university in 1835 under Olshausen, Höfling, Krafft, Hofmann and Harless. His great mental vivacity induced him to study almost all branches of human science and art, not, however, neglecting the pleasures and attractions of the student life. From 1838 to 1839 he studied at Berlin, where he was especially attracted by the philosopher Steffens. He also heard Hengstenberg, Neander, Twesten, Marheineke, Strauss, Ritter, Trendelenburg and others. After his examination in 1839 he accepted a position as pri-

1. Student Life and Early Lectures.

vate tutor and subsequently established himself in the philosophical faculty at Erlangen, lecturing in 1842 on the relation of philosophy to theology. In the same year he went over to the theological faculty and lectured on the Old and the New Testament and on the Reformation in Switzerland. At the same time he wrote a comprehensive work on the criticism of the history of the Gospels (Frankfort, 1842; Eng. transl. from the 2d ed., *The Gospel History*, Edinburgh, 1863) which made his name famous and put him in the front rank of opponents of D. F. Strauss. In 1844 he accepted a call to the University of

2. Professor at Zurich and Erlangen.

Zurich where he defended positive and Biblical Christianity against the radicalism of Strauss, and founded a weekly paper for that purpose, *Die Zukunft der Kirche*, which, however, was discontinued in 1847. His lectures were successful, but his relations with his radical colleagues and the educational authorities became so strained that he returned to Erlangen in 1847 after an independent chair for Reformed theology had been established. His native soil seemed to develop his many-sided powers into full maturity. He devoted himself to his lectures, attracting large circles of students, and treating chiefly

3. Councilor of the Consistory.

of dogmatics, but also of the Old and the New Testament and practical theology. He founded the *Reformierte Kirchenzeitung* and took an active part in all movements of the ecclesiastical and political life, in home missions and charitable work. From this stimulating work he was suddenly called away by an appointment as councilor of the consistory and chief preacher in Speyer (1853).

Ebrard considered it now his task to restore for the Church of the Palatinate the old Presbyterian government, which had been overthrown in 1848 " by a democratic subversion and by an ecclesiastical ochlocracy," and to give this Church a catechism and hymn-book in accordance with its faith. The question of the catechism was brought up at the general synod of 1853, and Ebrard succeeded

4. The New Catechism and Hymnbook.

in replacing the old catechism of 1818 by a compilation of the Heidelberg catechism and the smaller catechism of Luther and in establishing the *Augustana variata* of 1540 as the confession of the Church in the Palatinate. The constitution of the Church was also discussed at the synod. The aristocratic constitution of 1818 was restored, but it was conceded to the liberals that the number of the secular members of the diocesan synods should be made nearly equal to the number of pastors. The introduction of a new hymn-book, however, was much more difficult to effect. The opposition in the Church proceeded chiefly from the old rationalists. The people, who were filled with the liberal ideas of 1848, connected the introduction of the new orthodox hymn-book with hierarchism, but the general synod of 1857 took the part of the consistory and decided that the book should be accepted. The presbyteries, however, were not forced to accept it until another synod, to be held in 1861, should fix a definite time at which the introduction should be obligatory. Most of the congregations accepted the new hymn-book and peace might have ensued if the consistory had not committed the serious mistake of ordering the introduction of the book into all schools.

In this the liberal opposition found opportunity to incite the people against the supposed violence to conscience. Meetings were held and petitions were sent to the government, the ministry and the king, but the king did not think as yet of a

5. Victory of Ebrard's Opponents.

retreat, considering the resolutions of the general synods and consistories as binding. The final victory of the opposition was achieved by the legal expositions of Umbscheiden, a democratic jurist, in his treatise *Kirchengesetz und Kirchengewalt in der bayerischen Pfalz* (Munich, 1860). He showed that the mode of election instituted at the general synod of 1857 was illegal, that the government of the State had no power to sanction a changed constitution, and that therefore the democratic order of 1848 was still in force. Thereupon the ministry retreated and King Max issued a rescript in 1861 ordering the consistory to reestablish at the coming general synod the democratic order of election with an equal representation of the ecclesiastical and secular elements and the presbyteries and to permit the introduction of the new hymn-book only where the majority of the congregation gave consent.

Ebrard remained true to his convictions, and thus had to resign his position in 1861. He was

6. His Return to Erlangen.

forty-three years old and had spent the best part of his life in a vain cause. He returned to Erlangen and resumed his lectures, in 1862 in the presbyterial hall of the French Reformed congregation and after 1863 at the university, in his activity manifesting the spirit of his former years and retaining his vivacity, sociability, and many-sidedness until the end of his life. In theology he devoted himself to historical studies and somewhat later gathered material for an extensive work on *Apologetics* (2 parts, Gütersloh, 1874–75; Eng. transl., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1886–1887). In 1875 he undertook the French Reformed pastorate. From 1876 to 1886 he was also president of the moderamen of the Reformed synod, continuing all the while his lectures and literary work. Ebrard's scientific labor was devoted first to the defense of the fun-

7. Estimate of his Work.

damental facts of history and next to the eternal truths of Christianity. The mastery of almost all sciences revealed in his *Apologetik* is astonishing. His convictions centered in the Reformed Church, but he was not so narrow-minded as to deny the importance of Evangelical Christianity in general. His theology and devotional life may be characterized as a happy mean between orthodoxy and Pietism. His study of history saved him from a superficial radicalism and made him emphasize the peculiarities of the Reformed Church, especially in its organization and worship. In spite of his marked industry and the

fertility of his thought and writings, Ebrard made little impress upon the study of theology. While his many-sided activity had no creative effect in any individual sphere, the beneficent influences which proceeded from his engaging personality are immeasurable.

His works not already mentioned include *Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl und seiner Geschichte* (2 vols., Frankfort, 1845–46); *Christliche Dogmatik* (2 vols., Königsberg, 1851); *Vorlesungen über praktische Theologie* (1854); *Das Buch Hiob als poetisches Kunstwerk übersetzt und erklärt* (Landau, 1858); *Handbuch der christlichen Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte* (4 vols., Erlangen, 1865–66); *Die iroschottische Missionskirche des sechsten, siebenten, und achten Jahrhunderts* (Gütersloh, 1873); *Bonifatius* (1882). He edited and completed Olshausen's commentary by writing on the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, and the Epistles of John, published many sermons, and, under various pseudonyms, issued a long series of Christian belletristic productions.

(E. F. Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: The first part of his autobiography, *Lebensführungen, in jungen Jahren*, was published at Gütersloh, 1888; the rest of it, in MS., remains unprinted. Consult: P. Schaff, *Germany, Its Universities, Theology, and Religion*, pp. 389–397, New York, 1857; G. A. Scartazzini, in *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Kirchenzeitung*, no. 219–220, 1888.

ECCHELLENSIS, ABRAHAM. See Abraham Ecchellensis.

ECCLESIASTES.

The Contents (§ 1).
Who is the "Preacher"? (§ 2).
The Date (§ 3).
Egypt the Place of Composition (§ 4).
The Author's Viewpoint (§ 5).

Ecclesiastes (Heb. *Ḳoheleth*) is the title of the book which in the English Bible stands between Proverbs and the Song of Songs. A prologue, i. 2–11, and an epilogue, xii. 9–14, enclose the body of the book, and in both *Ḳoheleth* "The Preacher" is spoken of in the third person. The prologue gives the theme of the composition: All is vanity; man has no abiding profit from his toil; there is nothing new under the sun. The key-note is struck in i. 2, "all is vanity," and the book proper ends with the same note (xii. 8). In i. 12 the Preacher, in the first person, begins his proof of the fruitlessness of all man's striving, and presents in the first section, i. 12–ii. 23, the results of his collected experience as king in Jerusalem. Striving after wisdom, enjoyment, possessions, contented activity, he found unsatisfying, and the results insecure. This, however, is not the consequence of chance, but is the ordering of God which stands fast (ii. 24–iii. 22). Fear of God and moderation are the duties of man. The next section, iv.–vi., contains a series of observations and statements, the result of experience, which supplement and emphasize what precedes. The best rule of living is, according to the next division, vii. 1–ix. 10, to get out of life the most enjoyment possible. For although wisdom is best, yet the riddle of life is that rewards are proportionate neither to wisdom nor virtue. The last section, ix. 11–xii. 8, commends a prudential morality and grasping of present opportunities. The epilogue adds some words on the Preacher's wisdom, on wisdom-literature in general, and the conclusion: Fear God and keep his commandments.

1. The Contents.

Who is the person whose "I" appears so often in the book? In i. 2, vii. 27, and xii. 8 he is called *Ḳoheleth*; in i. 12 he gives himself this name and identifies himself with a wise, rich, brilliant king over Israel in Jerusalem who, according to the conception of the author, can be no other than Solomon. Of the many meanings of the word *Ḳoheleth* proposed only two call for serious consideration: (1) The word is a participial form with feminine ending but masculine meaning such as is found in late Hebrew (Pochereth, Ezra ii. 57; Sophereth, Neh. vii. 57), taken to mean "he who calls the assembly together" (and harangues). (2) The feminine sense of the ending is retained and some personified being (expressed in Greek as *Hē ekklēsiazousa*, "she who harangues") is represented as speaking. This can be no other than *Ḥokhma*, "Wisdom," but a specialized wisdom which deals with practicalities, with the art of living (cf. Prov. i. 21, viii. 1–3, ix. 3; Is. xl. 9). Herself timeless, in the days of Solomon (whose person was more or less in the writer's eye) she had begun to make observations, which she had continued through the centuries only to find ceaseless repetition characterizing the issue of events up to the time of the writing of the Book.

2. Who is the "Preacher"?

All data,—the historical references, the linguistic character, marking it as at the transition from the use of Hebrew to that of Mishnaic Aramaic, and the general tone of the work—compel the placing of the book at the end of the period when Hebrew was used. To secure a more exact dating than this is difficult. The view of Graetz that the book belongs to the time of Herod the Great involves a series of impossibilities and contradictions. Nor is the assignment by Jewish tradition to the "Men of Hezekiah" or to Solomon himself any more defensible. A more definite datum seems to be furnished in the fact that the Wisdom of Solomon stands to this book in a relation of hostility (cf. Wisd. of Sol. ii. 1–5, iii. 2–3 with Eccles. ix. 2, 5, 10, viii. 8, i. 11, etc., and Wisd. of Sol. ii. 6–9 with Eccles. ix. 7–9, iii. 22, v. 17). If the Wisdom of Solomon can be placed about 100 B.C., that furnishes the date than which Ḳoheleth can not be later. Whether the book of Sirach, the date of which does not go back of 200 B.C., implies the prior existence of Ecclesiastes can not with certainty be decided. The parallels between the two do not prove the dependence of Sirach, though it does seem possible that in Ecclus. xi. 11, xiv. 18, xxi. 12 the influence of Eccles. i. 2 can be discerned; similarly in the parallels Eccles. ix. 11 and Ecclus. xi. 12–13, the latter seems the younger. Ḳoheleth gives no sign that its author had shared in the awakening of patriotism and zeal for the national religion which the Maccabean rising inspired. The atmosphere of the book is that of the

3. The Date.

Wisdom literature, cosmopolitan rather than national. The limits of date are 430–200 B.C. The age of Nehemiah exhibits many characteristics which fit the historic situation presented by Ḳoheleth. On the other hand the philosophy of the book shows Greek influence in its terminology and its agreement with Stoic and Epicurean thought. In iii. 11, v. 18 the word *yaphe* occurs in the exact sense of the philosophic *kalon;* in iii. 12 "to do good" has the meaning of the Greek *eu prattein;* and these data involve a time when the Greek ferment had had time to work. On the other hand, the niceties and fine distinctions of the two schools of thought find no echo, only the commonplaces and superficialities of the Greek are reproduced. Not even the allegory in chap. xii. makes against this conclusion, since the thought is clearly conveyed in an Egyptian piece of poetry found in the tomb of Nefer-hotep (*Records of the Past*, vi. 129, cf. the "Festal Dirge," idem, iv. 117–118).

This, as well as many other items, speaks for the writing of the book in Egypt. For its composition in Jerusalem only one passage speaks (v. 1). The frequent mention (v. 8, viii. 2–5, x. 4–7, 16–20) of the nearness of the king's house suits Egypt, since in the times in which the book falls no king resided in Jerusalem. Residence near the sea is implied in xi. 1, reminding one of Alexandria, at the time the royal city, and the seat of a great Jewish settlement. The expression "king in Jerusalem" is peculiar to this book in the Old Testament; thoroughly Egyptian is the designation of the grave as the "everlasting house" (xii. 5 "long home"). The time and the place are indicated as that of the Ptolemies and their court, and before the oppression of the Jews under Ptolemy IV. Philopator; or between 320 and 217 B.C., and at Alexandria (cf. viii. 2, 8, with Josephus, *Ant.*, XII. i. 1). The coldness with which the author sets forth the worthlessness of wealth as an end for which to strive, the persistence with which he endures a mode of life which he would not choose and wishes to forget, the intensity with which he sets forth the humiliation to man from his zeal for knowledge in the face of the ordering and limitations of fate, all speak for such a setting.

4. Egypt the Place of Composition.

It is entirely comprehensible from these expressions how the newer exegesis comes to call the book "Skepticism's Song of Songs." But such a conception is a mistaken one. Beneath the questioning of the book lie strong religious convictions, the assurance that God Almighty rules the world. He is the creator (vii. 29, xii. 1), he is lord of life and the bestower of life on man (viii. 8, 15), he has allotted to man the quest and its toil (i. 13, iii. 10, 18, viii. 17), so that entire existence, vanity as it is, must be accepted as of God's ordering (ii. 26), though in the labor and the quest of life he grants joy to man (ii. 24, v. 18, vii. 18). How tragic it is that though the conception of eternity is in man's heart (iii. 11), yet its depths he can not fathom (vii. 23–24, viii. 17–ix. 1)! The purpose of God was to plant in the heart of man the fear of God (iii. 14, vii. 18), for God is the judge of compliance with the laws he has established (iii. 17, viii. 6–8). Things ethically good in the world are life (ix. 4–5), wisdom, companionship (iv. 7–12), success, and enjoyment of labor and its results (ii. 24, iii. 1–2, 22, ix. 7–8). Since issues are uncertain, the more urgent is the duty of constant striving (ix. 10, xi. 1–6). So that the sum to which a fading Judaism reduced the wealth of the prophetical faith is the certainty of one eternal God, creator and ruler of the world, and the certainty of his judgment. The method of reaching this conclusion is to put thesis and antithesis together so that the mean stands out from the very juxtaposition (iv. 4–6, v. 7–8, vii. 16–18). Yet this method of composition gave rise to the earlier suppositions that this juxtaposition of contradictory theses pointed to a discussion between two persons, or to an anthology, or to a mistake of the binder (or copyist). Similarly, the most opposite views of the teaching of the book have been held—that it involves the consequences of a sheer yet somewhat spiritual skepticism, and that it is a book of consolation.

5. The Author's Viewpoint.

It is not surprising therefore that its position in the canon should have been questioned, for example, in the debate in the first century between the schools of Hillel and Gamaliel. The integrity of the book is rightly questioned so far as the epilogue is concerned. But the remark of Graetz that xii. 11 sqq. refer not to this book but to the entire third division of the canon, and its corollary, that Ecclesiastes stood at the end of the Old Testament, are both in error. Indeed Graetz thinks that the entire epilogue was affixed by the Synod at Jabneh, c. 90 A.D., a conclusion demonstrably wrong. The book was read by the Jews at the Feast of Booths. (P. Kleinert.)

Bibliography: For literature on Ecclesiastes consult: A. Palm, *Die Qohelet-Literatur*, Mannheim, 1886, and the work of C. H. H. Wright, below. On the text, S. Euringer, *Der Massorahtext des Koheleth*, Leipsic, 1890. English translations are found in most of the commentaries; special and noteworthy are those by [N. Higgins], London, 1778, and P. Haupt, ib. 1905, both metrical. The Commentaries are very numerous, the best are: J. H. van der Palm, Leyden, 1784; F. Hitzig, Leipsic, 1847; E. W. Hengstenberg, Berlin, 1859, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1869; C. Bridges, London, 1860; C. D. Ginsburg, ib. 1861 (noteworthy); M. Stuart, Andover, 1862 (philological); L. Young, Philadelphia, 1866; J. N. Coleman, Edinburgh, 1867; H. Graetz, Leipsic, 1871; T. P. Dale, London, 1873; W H. B. Proby, ib. 1874; T. H. Leale, ib. 1877 (homiletical); E. H. Plumptre, Cambridge, 1881; E. Renan, Paris, 1882; G. G. Bradley, Oxford, 1885, new ed., 1898; T. C. Finlayson, *Meditations and Maxims of Koheleth*, London, 1887; W. Volck, Munich, 1889; M. J. Boileau, Paris, 1892; J. Strong, New York, 1893; C. Siegfried, Göttingen, 1898; G. Wildeboer, Tübingen, 1898; A. W. Streane, London, 1899; A. von Scholz, Leipsic, 1901; J. F. Genung, Boston, 1904; G. A. Barton, New York, 1908.

The works cited under Biblical Introduction, I. generally treat of the book, especially Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 436–449. On questions of this nature consult: A. H. McNeile, *Introduction to Ecclesiastes*, New York, 1904 (the best); J. S. Bloch, *Ursprung und Entstehungszeit des Buches Kohelet*, Bamberg, 1872; *A Treatise on the Authorship of Ecclesiastes*, London, 1880; C. H. H. Wright, *Book of Koheleth . in Relation to Modern Criticism and Pessimism*, ib. 1883; T. K. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, pp. 199–285, New York, 1889; P. Menzel, *Der griechische Einfluss auf Prediger*, Halle, 1880.

On the similarity to Omar Khayyam: J. F. Genung, *Ecclesiastes and Omar Khayyam*, Boston, 1901; A. Buchanan, *Essence of Ecclesiastes in Metre of Omar Khayyam*, London, 1904. On the history of interpretation: S. Schiffer, *Das Buch Coheleth nach Talmud und Midrasch*, Leipsic, 1885; M. M. Kalisch, *Path and Goal*, London, 1880. Consult also: *DB*, i. 637–642; *EB*, ii. 1155–64.

ECCLESIASTICUS. See APOCRYPHA, A, IV., 12.

ECCLESIOLOGY.

Definition and Methods (§ 1).
Ecclesiological Phenomena (§ 2).
Forms of Association (§ 3).
Types of Polity (§ 4).
Ecclesiastical Functions (§ 5).
Forces of Integration (§ 6).
Forces of Disintegration (§ 7).
Ecclesiastical Geography (§ 8).

Ecclesiology is the science dealing with the ecclesiastical institutions of human society. It is a social and not a theological science. If sociology be defined as the general science of human relations, ecclesiology is that branch of sociology which deals with so much of social phenomena as results directly from religious motives. The subject-matter of this science then embraces all ecclesiastical phenomena objective on the surface of society. It does not deal with theological dogma and creeds except in so far as religious faith and enthusiasm are seen to be the motives of ecclesiastical action. The science deals with non-Christian as well as Christian institutions among all races and nations. Ecclesiology being a distinctly social science, the methods of analysis, comparison, and generalization are those common to all the social sciences. As in the case of political science, the current institutions are analyzed, while the past is studied for origins and earlier forms. From the view-point of social science ecclesiastical history is the ecclesiology of past ages of human society.

1. Definition and Methods.

The primary social phenomena with which ecclesiology deals are individual speech and action for the purposes of religion. Such speech and action are possible on the surface of society only because ecclesiastical efforts have the sanction of the physically dominant institution of society, i.e., the State, and its representative, civil government. Without such sanction speech and action for the purposes of religion must of necessity be secret and beneath the surface of society. The observation of speech and action for the purposes of religion leads at once to the existing relation between Church and State, since the Church can not be one of the visible social institutions without the express or implied sanction of the State (see CHURCH AND STATE). Secondary ecclesiological phenomena found are association and cooperation for the purposes of religion. Such association may be temporary only, as is the case with assemblies or congregations, or it may be permanent and take the form of organization. Such organization may assume the form of an artificial legal personality provided for by the State, viz., the civil corporation for the purposes of religion. A third division of ecclesiological phenomena embraces the existing relations which the ecclesiastical institutions of society bear to its other institutions, viz., the State and civil government, marriage, the family, education, and wealth. A fourth division of phenomena embraces the various functions of ecclesiastical organizations, while a fifth includes what may be defined as ecclesiastical concepts or ideals which serve as motives for action and association.

2. Ecclesiological Phenomena.

The analysis of association and cooperation for the purposes of religion shows the following more or less permanent forms: the religious society, the Church proper or the body having the highest spiritual objects, the civil incorporation, whether aggregate or sole, which is often found in connection with the religious society or the Church, and finally the grouping of local religious bodies into organized general associations, usually styled denominations. Of the forms of local association it may be noted generally that they do not always coexist, but often occur separately The temporary assembly or congregation occurs without other form of association. The religious society exists by itself in cases where there is no separate body of communicant members or those having higher privilege and no civil incorporation has been effected. A church body existing alone may be seen in the community of a convent or monastery. A religious corporation may be seen without connection with a local religious society or church when constituted of the trustees of a fund devoted to the purposes of religion. It may be further noted of the forms of ecclesiastical association that they are found as a rule in some combination among the peoples of Western civilization. All of these forms of association are at times constituent parts of a local religious body, while the civil corporation is most frequently lacking. Generally the local religious bodies of all denominations present these forms of association, although in varying proportions and with different functions. The Church proper or spiritual body is the form of association that is usually found within the congregation and also within the religious society. It is the only form of association for the purposes of religion for which a special divine sanction is claimed. From the standpoint of the State it is the body having the highest interests to be protected, to whose welfare the other ecclesiastical bodies are to contribute.

3. Forms of Association.

The analysis of the forms of ecclesiastical association does not end with the limited and local forms of association, but extends to the combinations of these local bodies into groups scattered over large territories, some even coextensive with national domains. In this larger association for the purposes of religion the unit for combination among the several forms of local association is the Church or spiritual body, and the analysis proceeds from the local to the territorial association by ascertaining what relation, if any, exists between the local bodies and all other ecclesiastical bodies. The results of such a larger analysis may be summarized as follows: First, there are found local church bodies which, in the management of both their internal and external affairs, are autonomous and acknowledge and sustain no discernible relation with similar local church bodies other than that which may result from a general identity of purpose. Second, there

4. Types of Polity.

are found other local church bodies that do sustain a common relation. Such bodies are associated by yielding to a varying extent obedience to the jurisdiction of more general bodies or series of bodies. There are found to be two divisions of this second class. First, among some local church bodies of this second class the general authority or series of authorities have as a dominant characteristic of their jurisdiction the right to act in a judicial capacity in cases to which the subordinate local bodies or individual members of such bodies are parties. Second, among others of this second class the general authorities or series of authorities have as a dominant characteristic of their jurisdiction the right to administer a body of law which has been accepted by the local organizations. There are, therefore, three general forms or types of ecclesiastical association in modern society, and these are known as polities. There are (1) the congregational polity, with local church bodies showing every degree of actual autonomy (see CONGREGATIONALISTS, IV.); (2) the synodical or presbyterial polity, in which church administration is lodged in a graded series of courts with both original and appellate jurisdiction (see PRESBYTERIANS); and (3) the episcopal polity, in which the function of administration is vested in an individual (see BISHOP; EPISCOPACY). While there are many variations of these general forms of ecclesiastical organization, there does not occur among civilized people any variation sufficiently radical to constitute a fourth type. Such an analysis is the only safe means of securing a scientific classification of existing denominations according to their type of polity. This classification rests upon the actual facts of organization and not upon titles, which are often misleading. The large number of religious denominations of Western civilization alone present almost every conceivable variety of ecclesiastical organization. Yet they are susceptible of scientific classification on the basis here outlined, and may, of course, be further subdivided and classified according to their peculiarities.

5. Ecclesiastical Functions.

A fourth division of the subject-matter of ecclesiology deals with the functions which ecclesiastical bodies perform. As in the case of political institutions, the primary function is that of legislation, the making of the internal law of the organization. Such law is either organic, fundamental, or constitutional, or it is in the nature of statutes or by-laws and therefore more easily amended. The rule prevails throughout the countries of Western civilization that ecclesiastical bodies may not enact law containing provisions contrary to the law of the land, and that the fundamental principles of the civil law to the extent that they define and protect civil and property rights will by the civil courts be read into any body of church law. The second ecclesiastical function is that of administration. The problems that arise in the course of ecclesiastical administration call for the exercise of the third function, that of adjudication or the judicial application of law to specific cases. The normal supplement of the function of adjudication is that of discipline (see CHURCH DISCIPLINE), by which the penalty for the violation of ecclesiastical law is enforced. The exercise of this function of discipline seems to be weakening in many ecclesiastical bodies, but, on the other hand, it should be remembered that the sphere of ecclesiastical discipline has in modern civilization been greatly restricted by civil law. The two remaining functions of ecclesiastical organizations are those of propaganda and mission. Propaganda is the conscious and systematic spread of faith and principles, while the mission, which naturally supplements propaganda, is the function of reproducing the ecclesiastical organization from which emanated the particular propaganda. Ecclesiologists are inclined to look upon the rigor with which these functions are performed as being to a certain extent a measure of the vitality of the body. Different organizations vary greatly as to the relative values of these functions and as to the energy with which they are to be exercised. In the simplest and most completely autonomous bodies there is a concentration of these functions in a single organ, while among bodies having more complex polities there is a distribution of powers and frequently a highly developed machinery.

6. Forces of Integration.

Up to this point has been outlined what may be called static ecclesiology. There is, however, a field which may be defined as that of dynamic ecclesiology. Here the subject-matter comprises the social and economic environments of ecclesiastical bodies and the moral forces at work tending to change the spirit and the structure of such bodies. Ecclesiastical institutions are, from the standpoint of the social sciences, aggregations of living social organism and subject to a certain extent to the laws of social development. They are seen to have forces of original impetus, to have their periods of development, and frequently their periods of decay and dissolution. A natural division of such social and moral forces is into those working for the integration of ecclesiastical bodies, and those working for their disintegration. The same force under differing conditions works in opposite directions. The dominant forces working for the integration of ecclesiastical bodies are the influences of education and of material wealth, energy in propaganda and mission, and, perhaps more potent than these, certain ecclesiastical concepts or ideals such as those of the historical continuity of the Church and those of ecclesiastical adaptation. The dominant forces working for the disintegration of ecclesiastical bodies are the lack of education, the lack of missionary energy, the lack of material wealth, such ecclesiastical concepts or ideals as those of isolation and alienation, and the tendency to heresy and its normal result, schism. While the tendency to schism is the most obvious of all disintegrating forces, it is probably not as fundamental as certain concepts which require explanation in order to a due appreciation of their influence. Among the forces operating for continuous ecclesiastical integration are the concepts of adaptation and of the historical continuity of the Church. The ideal of ecclesiastical adaptation results from the desire on the part of members of religious bodies to have their organization keep in complete touch with all the normal features of its social environment. Under the in-

fluence of such a concept the form or type of ecclesiastical organization is regarded as more or less immaterial. What is sought is a perfect adaptation of ecclesiastical organization and functions to what are believed to be the needs of the time and the community Closely allied to such an ideal is often found the belief that human society has the capacity for its own regeneration; consequently it is better to hold that religious institutions are to be regarded as the result of such efforts than that the Church is a unique organization among men, having a special divine sanction and charged with a supernatural mission. The integrating force of such a concept lies in its capacity for cooperation and in the emphasis which it places upon agreement in matters of faith while minimizing the differences. The concept of the historical continuity of the Church is based upon a belief that there is one normal organization, that this normal organization has been realized in part, and that if the right spirit prevails, preventing all heresy and schism, this normal organization is revealed. It is further believed by those holding this concept that a substantial continuity of all the essential features of this normal organization has been maintained in all the past ages and will be maintained until the end of human society. Such concepts are not confined to the members of what are commonly known as the historic churches, although there it is more common. Such concepts admit of successive changes in what are regarded as the non-essential features of polity due to the changing conditions of social and political environment. But such changes are regarded as incidental and as revealing in an ever-widening range those essential features which shall in the providence of God persist until the end of time. The Church with such an ideal would not antagonize the existing order of society, but it would perpetuate those features of its polity which it deems essential to its character as a true Church. Certain facts should be noted of these ecclesiastical ideals. First, that they are held with varying degrees of intelligence and devotion; second, they are widely distributed, no organization or denomination having a monopoly of any of them; third, all of these concepts serve as stimuli to the members of a single organization; and, fourth, the different ecclesiastical bodies vary greatly as to their consciousness of the operation of these concepts as motives of action.

Concepts or ideals of ecclesiastical isolation and alienation are found to be exercising a profound influence among certain organizations. Such concepts appear to develop from a religious conviction which frequently assumes the form of a belief that certain persons are called of God out of the mass of human society to be constituted and recognized as a peculiar people to lead a life apart from the life of the community in which they have their habitation. Such a concept provides for the least possible intercourse between the members of the religious body and those who differ with them in matters religious. Among certain of the Christian bodies this concept derives its inspiration from the history of the Hebrews and from a feeling that theirs is a similar case, they being called out of a corrupt society to lead a peculiarly religious life. Among other bodies ecclesiastical alienation develops from a desire on the part of a body of individuals to lead a certain mode of life and to practise such moral and economic effects as celibacy or community of goods, while the normal social environment is regarded as unfavorable for such a development. In many cases where such concepts prevail those holding them decline to recognize the normal obligations resting upon members of society for the maintenance of civil government and other social institutions. Such ecclesiastical alienation usually operates by restricting missionary effort. Deliberate alienation must not be confused with the physical isolation in which many religious bodies find themselves.

7. Forces of Disintegration.

In addition to the qualitative analysis of ecclesiastical institutions here outlined, the science of ecclesiology provides also for a quantitative analysis for which the material is largely statistical. Denominational statistics are generally deficient, and only a few countries of Western civilization furnish reliable governmental statistics of ecclesiastical organizations. The use of such statistics has three objects: to determine the amount of ecclesiastical association among a given population; to determine the racial elements of church-membership; and to determine the territorial distribution of denominational strength. This may be called ecclesiastical geography. The racial simplicity or complexity of the membership of a religious body is often found to have a profound influence upon the development of the organization. As in bodies political, church racial elements are often the source of weakness and the cause of delayed integration, especially where diversity of language is a serious obstacle. Such a diversity, however, is a test, and affords a training in the capacity of assimilation. Religious bodies as a rule originate in a homogeneous people, but systematic missionary effort has brought into the membership of all the stronger and more active denominations the most diverse racial elements. Closely allied to this topic is that of the geography of the Church. The systematic charting of ecclesiastical organizations is of recent origin. It is now being developed on every scale, from the population of a single city to that of a continent. It has been brought to the aid of the churches in the planning of missionary enterprises of all dimensions. It has been found useful in revealing the physical and social environment of churches, and it throws much light on their history and state of development. See CHURCH, THE CHRISTIAN; CHURCH AND STATE; and POLITY, ECCLESIASTICAL.

8. Ecclesiastical Geography.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES.

ECK, JOHANN.

Education. Teacher at Ingolstadt (§ 1).
Disputations with Luther and Carlstadt (§ 2).
Attacks on Luther and Melanchthon (§ 3).
Papal Emissary and Inquisitor (§ 4).
Zwingli and his Followers (§ 5).
Peace Overtures (§ 6).

Johann Eck (properly Johann Maier or Mayr) the German Roman Catholic controversialist, was born at Eck (now Egg, near Memmingen, 43 m. s. of Augsburg), Swabia, Nov. 13, 1486; d. at Ingolstadt Feb. 13, 1543. At the age of twelve he entered the

University of Heidelberg, which he left in the following year for Tübingen. After taking his master's degree in 1501, he began the study of theology under Johann Jakob Lempp, and studied the elements of Hebrew and political economy with Konrad Summenhart. He left Tübingen in 1501 on account of the plague and after a year at Cologne finally settled at Freiburg-im-Breisgau, at first as a student of theology and law and later as a successful teacher. In 1508 he entered the priesthood and two years later obtained his doctorate in theology. At Freiburg in 1506 he published his first work, *Ludicra logices exercitamenta* and also proved himself a brilliant and subtle orator, although obsessed by an untamable controversial spirit and unrestrained powers of invective. At odds with his collcagues, he was glad to accept a call to a theological chair at Ingolstadt in Nov., 1510, receiving at the same time the honors and income of a canon at Eichstädt. In 1512 he became prochancellor at the university and from that time until his death he was in complete control of the destinies of Ingolstadt, on which he impressed the character of ultracatholicism which made it a bulwark of the ancient faith in Germany. His wide knowledge found expression in numerous writings. In the theological field he produced his *Chrysopassus* (Augsburg, 1514), in which he developed a Semi-Pelagian theory of predestination, while he obtained some fame as commentator on the *Summulæ* of Peter of Spain and on Aristotlc's *De cœlo* and *De anima*. As a political economist he defended interest, despite the opposition of the bishop of Eichstädt.

1. Education. Teacher at Ingolstadt.

As early as the spring of 1517 Eck had entered into friendly relations with Luther, who had regarded him as in harmony with his own views, but this illusion was short-lived. In his *Obelisci* Eck attacked Luther's theses, which had been sent him by Scheurl, and accused him of promoting the heresy of the Bohemian Brethren and of fostering anarchy within the Church. Luther replied in his *Asterisci adversus obeliscos Eccii*, while Carlstadt defended Luther's views of indulgences and engaged in a violent controversy with Eck. A mutual desire for a public disputation led to a compact between Eck and Luther by which the former pledged himself to meet Carlstadt in debate at Erfurt or Leipsic, on condition that Luther abstain from all participation in the discussion. In Dec., 1518, Eck published the twelve theses which he was prepared to uphold against Carlstadt, but since they were aimed at Luther rather than at the ostensible opponent, Luthcr addressed an open letter to Carlstadt, in which he declared himself ready to meet Eck in debate.

2. Disputations with Luther and Carlstadt.

The disputation between Eck and Carlstadt began at Leipsic June 27, 1519. In the first four sessions Eck maintained the thesis that free will is the active agent in the creation of good works, but he was compelled by his opponent to modify his position so as to concede that the grace of God and free will work in harmony toward the common end. Carlstadt then proceeded to prove that good works are to be ascribed to the agency of God alone, whereupon Eck yielded so far as to admit that free will is passive in the beginning of conversion, although he maintained that in course of time it enters into its rights; so that while the entirety of good works originates in God, their accomplishment is not entirely the work of God. Despite the fact that Eck was thus virtually forced to abandon his position, he succeeded, through his good memory and his dialectic skill, in confusing the heavy-witted Carlstadt and carried off the nominal victory. He was far less successful against Luther, who, as Eck himself confessed, was his superior in memory, acumen, and learning. After a disputation lasting twenty-three days (July 4–27), Eck was greeted as victor by the theologians of the University of Leipsic, who overwhelmed him with honors and sent him away with gifts. The impression produced by Eck upon his auditors during that momentous time may be best learned from the account of the humanist Peter of Moselle, who described him as tall, stout, and squarely built. His voice was full and rolling, and of an admirable quality for an actor, or even for a public crier, while the sum total of his features would seem to argue the butcher or the professional soldier rather than the theologian. As far as his intellectual gifts were concerned, he had a wonderful memory, which, if supplemented by other talents in like proportion, would have made him a marvel, but he lacked swiftness of apprehension and deep insight, so that his masses of arguments and citations were indiscriminate, and he was filled with an inconceivable impudence though he had the cleverness to conceal it.

Soon after his return to Ingolstadt, Eck attempted to persuade Elector Frederick of Saxony to have Luther's works burned in public, and during the year 1519 he published no less than eight writings against the new movement. He failed, however, to obtain a condemnatory decision from the universities appointed to pronounce on the outcome of the Leipsic disputation. Erfurt returned the proceedings of the meeting to the Saxon duke without signifying its approval, while Paris, after repeated urging, gave an ambiguous decision limited to " the doctrine of Luther so far as investigated." Eck's only followers were the aged heretic-hunter Hoogstraten and Emser of Leipsic, together with the allied authorities of the universities of Cologne and Louvain. Luther returned Eck's assaults with more than equal vehemence and about this time Melanchthon wrote Œcolampadius that at Leipsic he had first become distinctly aware of the difference between true Christian theology and the scholasticism of the Aristotelian doctors. In his *Excusatio* (Wittenberg? 1519?) Eck, irritated all the more because early in thc year he had induced Erasmus to caution the young theological student against precipitating himself into the religious conflict, retorted that Melanchthon knew nothing of theology. In his reply to the *Excusatio*, Melanchthon

3. Attacks on Luther and Melanchthon.

proved that he was thoroughly versed in theology, and Eck fared still worse in October of the same year, when he sought to aid Emser by a virulent tirade against Luther. Two biting satires, one by Œcolampadius and the other by Pirkheimer, stung him to a fury which would be satisfied with nothing less than the public burning of the entire literature in the market-place at Ingolstadt, an act from which he was restrained by his colleague Reuchlin.

Eck was far more highly esteemed as the dauntless champion of the true faith at Rome than in Germany. In Jan., 1520, he visited Italy at the invitation of Leo X., to whom he presented his latest work *De primatu Petri adversus Ludderum* (Ingolstadt, 1520) for which he was rewarded with the nomination to the office of papal prothonotary, although his efforts to urge the Curia to decisive action against Luther were unsuccessful for some time. On June 16, however, appeared the fateful bull *Exurge Domine*, in which forty-one propositions of Luther were condemned as heretical or erroneous. Entrusted with the publication of the bull in Germany, Eck returned home, only to find how rapidly Luther had gained favor. At Meissen, Brandenburg, and Merseburg he succeeded in giving the papal measure due official publicity, but at Leipsic he was the object of the ridicule of the student body and was compelled to flee by night to Freiberg, where he was again prevented from proclaiming the bull. At Erfurt the students tore the instrument down and threw it into the water, while in other places the papal decree was subjected to still greater insults. At Vienna its publication encountered grave difficulties, and Eck had good cause to set up a votive tablet to his patron saint upon his safe return to Ingolstadt, although even there only the authority of the papal mandate made the publication of the bull possible. This last humiliation was due, in great measure, to the fact that he had availed himself of the permission to pronounce the papal censure on prominent followers of the new movement besides Luther, and had thus made his office a means of personal revenge. Eck's letter to Charles V., written in Feb., 1521, seems to have had little effect upon the proceedings at the Diet of Worms.

4. Papal Emissary and Inquisitor.

Wealth and power were included in the aspirations of Eck. He appropriated the revenues of his parish of Günzburg, while he relegated its duties to a vicar. Twice he visited Rome as a diplomatic representative of the Bavarian court to obtain sanction for the establishment of a court of inquisition against the Lutheran teachings at Ingolstadt. The first of these journeys, late in the autumn of 1521, was fruitless on account of the death of Leo X., but his second journey in 1523 was successful. With great insight and courage he showed the Curia the true condition of affairs in Germany and pictured the general incapacity of the representatives of the Church in that country. Of the many heresy trials in which Eck was the prime mover during this period it is sufficient to mention here that of Leonhard Käser, whose history was published by Luther.

In addition to his inquisitorial duties, every year witnessed the publication of one or more writings against iconoclasm and in defense of the doctrines of the mass, purgatory, and auricular confession. His *Enchiridion locorum communium adversus Lutherum et alios hostes ecclesiæ* (Landshut, 1525) went through forty-six editions before 1576. As its title indicates, it was directed primarily against Melanchthon's *Loci*, although it also concerned itself to some extent with the teachings of Zwingli. Eck offered to refute Zwingli's "heresies" in a public disputation (Aug. 13, 1524), and appeared at Baden, only 12 m. n.w. of Zurich, but in the hands of the bitterest partizans of the Roman Church, and from May 21 until June 18, 1526, the debate went on. Zwingli was not present, but supported his friends who were there by constant suggestions. The affair ended decidedly in favor of Eck, who induced the authorities to enter on a course of active persecution of Zwingli and his followers (see BADEN [IM AARGAU], CONFERENCE OF). The effect of his victory at Baden was dissipated, however, at the Disputation of Bern (Jan., 1528), where the propositions advanced by the Reformers were debated in the absence of Eck, and Bern, Basel, and other places were definitely won for the Reformation (see BERN, DISPUTATION OF). At the Diet of Augsburg Eck played the leading part among theologians on the Roman Catholic side.

5. Zwingli and his Followers.

While still at Ingolstadt Eck drafted for the use of the emperor a list of 404 heretical propositions from the writings of the Reformers, and collaborated with more than twenty Catholic theologians in writing the *confutatio pontificia*, in which the Catholic refutation of the Protestants was embodied. His efforts at peace, in which his readiness to meet the Reformers half-way shows him to have been sincere, failed, however, on account of the hatred and contempt with which he was regarded by the Protestant theologians. He renewed his efforts at Worms in Jan., 1541, and succeeded in impressing Melanchthon as being quite prepared to give his assent to the main principles of Protestantism. After the meeting at Regensburg in the spring and summer of the same year, on the other hand, he exerted himself to prevent any compromise between the two theologies. The last important phase of his activity was his conflict with Butzer, whom he attacked on account of the attitude assumed by the latter in his edition of the transactions of the Conference of Regensburg (q.v.). Special mention should be made, among Eck's many writings, of his German translation of the Bible (the New Testament a revision of H. Emser's rendering) which was first published at Ingolstadt in 1537. (C. ENDERS.)

6. Peace Overtures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck*, Regensburg, 1865; J. Greving, *J. Eck als junger Gelehrter*, Münster, 1906. The subject is treated in more or less detail in all works on the Church history of the period, in the accounts of the life of Luther, Melanchthon, Œcolampadius, Osiander, and Zwingli (see the literature under those articles). Consult particularly Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 168 sqq.; Moeller, *Christian Church*, vol. iii.; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., New York, 1904.

ECKHART.

I. Life.
Various Appointments (§ 1).
Heresy Charges (§ 2).
II. Eckhart as Author, Schoolman, Mystic, and Preacher.
His Works (§ 1).
Schoolman and Mystic (§ 2).
As a Preacher (§ 3).
III. System.
His Fundamental View of Deity (§ 1).
The Trinitarian Process (§ 2).
God in Creation (§ 3).
The Relation of the Soul to God (§ 4).
Sin and Redemption (§ 5).
The Place of Christ (§ 6).
Eckhart's Ethics (§ 7).

Meister Eckhart, as he is generally called, Dominican and mystic, was a man almost forgotten after the middle of the fifteenth century until Franz von Baader in the first half of the nineteenth century revived his memory. Since then he has been highly praised. But Denifle again passed a somewhat derogatory judgment upon him on the basis of newly discovered Latin writings; inasmuch as Denifle has published but a small part of these writings his opinion can not be too implicitly accepted. This article will attempt merely to give accredited facts and indicate the present state of the questions.

I. Life: The long controverted question concerning the locality of Eckhart's origin has been settled by Denifle, who states that he was born at Hochheim, a village 8 miles north of Gotha. The year of his birth was probably 1260, and he joined the Dominicans at Erfurt. The lighter studies he no doubt followed at Cologne. Later he was prior at Erfurt and provincial of Thuringia.

1. Various Appointments. In 1300 he was sent to Paris to lecture and take the academical degrees, and remained there till 1303. In the latter year he returned to Erfurt, and was made provincial for Saxony, a province which reached at that time from the Netherlands to Livonia. Complaints made against him and the provincial of Teutonia at the general chapter held in Paris in 1306 concerning irregularities among the tertiaries, must have been trivial, because the general, Aymeric, appointed him in the following year his vicar-general for Bohemia with full power to set the demoralized monasteries there in order. In 1311 Eckhart was appointed by the general chapter of Naples as teacher at Paris. Then follows a long period of which it is known only that he spent part of the time at Strasburg (cf. *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Strassburg*, iii. 236). A passage in a chronicle of the year 1320, extant in manuscript (cf. Preger, i. 352–399), speaks of a prior Eckhart at Frankfort who was suspected of heresy, and some have referred this to Meister Eckhart; but it is highly improbable that a man under suspicion of heresy would have been appointed teacher in one of the most famous schools of the order.

2. Heresy Charges. Eckhart next appears as teacher at Cologne, and the archbishop, Hermann von Virneburg, accused him of heresy before the pope. But Nicholas of Strasburg (q.v.), to whom the pope had given the temporary charge of the Dominican monasteries in Germany, exonerated him. The archbishop, however, pressed his charges against Eckhart and against Nicholas before his own court. The former now denied the competency of the archiepiscopal inquisition and demanded *litteræ dimissoriæ* (*apostoli*) for an appeal to the pope (cf. the document in Preger, i. 471; more accurately in *ALKG*, ii. 627 sqq.). On Feb. 13, 1327, he stated in his protest, which was read publicly, that he had always detested everything wrong, and should anything of the kind be found in his writings, he now retracts. Of the further progress of the case there is no information, except that John XXII. issued a bull (*In agro dominico*), Mar. 27, 1329, in which a series of statements from Eckhart is characterized as heretical, another as suspected of heresy (the bull is given complete in *ALKG*, ii. 636–640). At the close it is stated that Eckhart recanted before his death everything which he had falsely taught, by subjecting himself and his writings to the decision of the apostolic see. By this is no doubt meant the statement of Feb. 13, 1327; and it may be inferred that Eckhart's death, concerning which no information exists, took place shortly after that event. In 1328 the general chapter of the order at Toulouse decided to proceed against preachers who "endeavor to preach subtle things which not only do (not) advance morals, but easily lead the people into error." Eckhart's disciples were admonished to be more cautious, but nevertheless they cherished the memory of their master.

II. Eckhart as Author, Schoolman, Mystic, and Preacher: For centuries none of Eckhart's writings were known except a number of sermons, found in the old editions of Tauler's sermons, published by Kachelouen (Leipsic, 1498) and by Adam Petri (Basel, 1521 and 1522). In 1857 Franz Pfeiffer in the second volume of his *Deutsche Mystiker* (Stuttgart), which is wholly devoted to Eckhart, added considerable manuscript material. Pfeiffer was followed by others, especially Franz Jostes, *Meister Eckhart und seine Jünger, ungedruckte Texte zur Geschichte der deutschen Mystik* (*Collectanea Friburgensia*, iv., Freiburg, 1895). But some pieces are of doubtful genuineness, and the tradition concerning others is very unsatisfactory. It was a great surprise when in 1880 and 1886 H. Denifle discovered at Erfurt and Cues two manuscripts with Latin works of Eckhart, the existence of which Nicholas of Cusa and Trittenheim had indeed mentioned, but which had since then been considered lost. There can be no doubt as to their genuineness, but thus far only the (comparatively extensive) specimens which Denifle had published (in *ALKG*, ii.) are known. The extant writings appear to be only parts of a very large work, the *Opus tripartitum*, which, to judge from the prologue in the first part treated of more than 1,000 propositions, in the second part debated a number of special questions, and in the third part, first expounded Biblical texts (*opus sermonum*) and afterward explained the books of the Bible in their order with special reference to the important passages. Entirely unknown at present are the contents of the more important manuscript of Cues,

1. His Works.

especially the exposition of the Gospel of John, which may contain information on many things.

Some deductions, however, can be made. In the first place, it appears that Eckhart was a true scholastic, who reflected upon and treated all the numerous questions which interested scholasticism in general. That there existed an opposition in principle between mysticism and scholasticism is in his case out of the question, because at that time it did not exist at all, as was long ago proved by Engelhardt (*Richard von St. Victor und Johannes Ruysbroek*, Erlangen, 1838, preface). As a scholastic, as far as sentences and elegance of description are concerned, Eckhart seems to be inferior to Thomas Aquinas, whom he follows for the most part. For the rest it is worthy of notice that the sphere of subjects, which especially engaged Eckhart's mind, is limited in his Latin writings. His thoughts are concentrated on the divine being in its unity and trinity; on the relation between God and the creature, especially between God and the human soul; on the nature of the soul; on regeneration and union with God, to which he recurs again and again. But these objects are the very ones with which mysticism especially used to concern itself. Even as a scholastic Eckhart shows a predominant leaning toward mysticism. Eckhart's sermons are primarily for monks or nuns, and, indeed, according to Denifle (*ALKG*, ii. 641, 652), the German sermon of the Dominicans in general originated from the care of the nunneries. But when the sermon was delivered in the church, other hearers were not excluded, and Eckhart sometimes refers to them (Pfeiffer, 287, 26). Indeed, his sermons presuppose a religiously educated and interested congregation.

2. Schoolman and Mystic.

It is possible that no preacher ever propounded to his hearers more lofty and profound speculations on the Deity and the world, on the soul and its life. But he does it not for the sake of ostentation nor because of mere pleasure in these speculations, but because he is convinced that thus he will best serve his hearers. He knew that not all could follow him (Pfeiffer, 209, 29; 242, 35), and such he exhorted to piety (310, 1; 498, 18). For him these thoughts were most intimately connected with his spiritual life and they are therefore expressed with a fervor and ardor which could not fail to impress the more intelligent of his hearers. He is convinced that the thoughts which he presents are found in the Scripture in which he has more faith than in himself (4, 17). The present custom of taking a text for the sermon did not restrict him and in accordance with the use of his time he selects only a phrase, a "word" from a larger section. This mode of exposition is such that he can easily deduce any thought from any text. To us his method appears like an incredible abuse of Holy Writ, but Eckhart practised it in good faith; he followed the custom of his time, and no one took offense. On the other hand Eckhart is truly great in the way and manner in which he gave form and expression to his thoughts. This is clearly to be seen in spite of the faults of the copies, to which must be ascribed the disproportion of the execution and the want of connection. One might say that truth and purity of sentiment, to which he everywhere attaches the greatest value, also shapes his sermon. He avoids all tinsel, every artificial adornment. He speaks in an artless, pleasing and touching manner. Powerful seriousness and humor are at his command. He often uses parables, but briefly, without detail, and this brevity he also applies where the narrative elements prevail (13, 25; 108; 168, 12; 285, 24). While he often enlivens his discourse by introducing thesis and antithesis, his manner is truly German, his sentences are devoid of the influence of Latin phraseology. Not a few passages of his sermons have a beauty of language which to this day makes them worthy of commendation as models of German style.

3. As a Preacher.

III. System: As has already been stated it is impossible to give at present a final decision on Eckhart's world of ideas. Nevertheless an attempt may be made to delineate his fundamental thoughts, based upon the material at hand. The great need of man is that his soul be united with God; for this a knowledge of God and his relation to the world, a knowledge of the soul and the way which it must go, are necessary. Eckhart does not doubt that such knowledge is given in the traditional faith of the Church, but it is not sufficient for one who is longing for salvation. He must attain to it with his own understanding. Eckhart accordingly does not move and live in ecclesiastical tradition after the manner of Bernard of Clairvaux or Hugo of St. Victor; in his thinking on the highest questions he is independent and in this way he arrives at views which do not harmonize with the teaching of the Church, without, however, as far as can be seen, being conscious of any opposition. The last and highest object of thinking is the Deity, i.e. the divine entity as distinguished from the persons, yet Eckhart often uses "God" in the sense of "Deity," where his thought does not call for accurate definitions (but cf., on the other hand, 180, 14; 181, 7). The Deity is absolute being without distinction of place or manner (*ALKG*, ii. 439–440). No predicate derived from finite being is applicable to the Deity; but this is therefore not mere negation or emptiness. Rather is finite being, as such, negation; and the Deity, as the negation of finite being, is the negation of negation, i.e. the absolute fulness of being (322, 13; 539, 10–27). Dionysius wrongly states: God is not, he is rather a nonentity. When in other passages (82, 26; 182, 31; 500, 27) Eckhart himself designates God as non-existent, he only means that he has none of the characteristics of finite existence. The same apparent contradiction is found, where Eckhart on the one hand calls God absolute being, and on the other denies that he is a being (319, 4; 659, 1); but he reconciles the two views (268–269). The same is the case with occasional seemingly paradoxical expressions, e.g. that God is not good, etc. (269, 18; 318, 35–319, 3). The essential elements of finite things are present in God, but in an exalted degree and in a manner that can not be comprehended by man (322, 20; 540, 2–7).

1. His Fundamental View of Deity.

The absolute, unqualified being of the Deity Eckhart also calls unnatured nature. This unnatured nature, however, manifests itself in the natured nature, the three persons. The Trinity is the self-revelation of the Deity (540, 31; 390, 12–22). In it God comprises himself. Accordingly, Eckhart attributes to the Father a sort of genesis; only the Deity is absolutely without any progression and reposes everlastingly in itself. The Father was made through himself (534, 17). This self-revelation of God Eckhart designates as a cognition, a speaking, or a demeanor. The Father perceives the whole fulness of the Deity (6,8); or, what is the same, he speaks a single word, which comprises everything (76, 25). He procreates

2. The Trinitarian Process.

the Son (284, 12); for the Father is father only through the Son. The Son, however, is in everything like the Father, only that he procreates not (337, 3). The essence of the Father is also that of the Son, and the essence in both is no other than that of the Deity. From the pleasure and love which both have for each other springs the Holy Ghost (497, 26). Eckhart leaves no doubt that the entire trinitarian process must not be conceived of as a temporal one, but as a process extending throughout eternity (254, 10). Preger thought that Eckhart's distinction between Deity and God should be interpreted as a distinction between potentiality and actuality. To this interpretation Denifle (*ALKG*, ii. 453 sqq.) has strongly objected and cited Eckhart's Latin writings, in which he, with Thomas Aquinas and others, designates God as *actus purus*, thus excluding all potentiality. Denifle is right, in that Eckhart does not consciously and deliberately make any such distinction; but it can not be denied that his conception leads to it. Especially significant is Eckhart's explanation in 175, 7 sqq. where he tries to illustrate the relation between the fatherhood as it is determined in the Deity and the paternity of the person of the Father by the relation between the maternity peculiar to the Virgin as such, and the maternity which she acquires by bearing. But this is exactly the relation of potentiality and actuality (cf. also the peculiar passage 193, 33). It must be admitted that Eckhart here expresses two views which can not be harmonized with one another, though the second is not fully developed. Eckhart had a wealth of ingenious ideas, but he was unable to systematize them.

The self-manifestation of God in the Trinity is followed by his manifestation in his creatures. Everything in them that is truly real is God's eternal being; but God's being does not manifest itself thus in its entire fulness (101, 34; 173, 26; 503, 26). In this antithesis may be expressed the relation of Eckhart's philosophy to pantheism, both as regards similarities and differences. According to Eckhart God's creatures have

3. God in Creation.

not, as Thomas Aquinas held, merely ideal preexistence in God, i.e. their conceptual essence (*essentia, quidditas*) coming from the divine intelligence, but their existence (*esse*) being foreign to the divine being. Rather is the true being of the creatures immanent in the divine being. On the other hand, every peculiarity distinguishing creatures from each other is something negative; and in this sense it is said that the creatures are a mere nothing. Should God withdraw from his creatures his being, they would disappear as the shadow on the wall disappears when the wall is removed (31, 2). This perishable being is the creature confined within the limits of space and time (87, 49). On the other hand, every creature, considered according to its true entity, is eternal. It is obvious that this necessarily involves a modification of the idea of creation. Even Augustine and the Schoolmen felt this difficulty. While they did not, like Eckhart connect the existence of the world with the being of God they did consider it unallowable to attribute to God any temporary activity. Albert the Great tried to avoid the difficulty with the sentence, "God created all things from eternity, but things were not created from eternity"; but this is more easily said than conceived. According to the bull of 1329 (p. 2), Eckhart asserted that "it may be conceded that the world was from eternity." It is impossible here to investigate this view further; but reference must be made to the close relation into which Eckhart brings the process of the Trinity and the genesis, or progress, of the world, both of the real and the ideal world (76, 52; 254, 16; 284, 12; cf. *Com. in Genes.*, *ALKG*, ii. 553, 13–17).

The unqualified Deity, the Trinity (birth of the Son or of the Eternal Word), and the creation of the world are to him three immediate moments, which follow each other in conceptual, not temporal sequence. All creatures have part in the divine essence; but this is true of the soul in a higher degree. In the irrational creature there is something of God; but in the soul God is divine (230, 26; 231, 4). Though God speaks his word in all creatures, only rational creatures can preserve it (479, 19). In other words, in the soul, where he has his resting-place, God is subjective, while in the rest of creation he is merely objective. The soul is an image of God, in so far as

4. The Relation of the Soul to God.

its chief powers, memory, reason, and will, answer to the divine persons (319, 1). This accords with the view of Augustine. Just as there is the absolute Deity, which is superior to the persons of the Godhead, so in the soul there is something that is superior to its own powers. This is the innermost background of the soul, which Eckhart frequently calls a "spark," or "little spark." In its real nature this basis of the soul is one with the Deity (66, 2). When Eckhart sometimes speaks of it as uncreated (286, 16; 311, 6), and then again as created, this does not involve a contradiction. While, on the one hand, it rests eternally in the Deity, on the other it entered into the temporal existence of the soul, i.e. was made or created through grace. But it is not in this original unity with God that the soul finds its perfection and bliss. As it has a subjective being, it must turn to God, in order that the essential principle implanted in it may be truly realized. It is not enough that it was made by God; God must come and be in it. But this has taken place without

hindrance only in the human soul of Christ (67, 12). For all other souls sin is an obstacle.

But wherein does sin consist? Not in the finiteness, which is never removed from the soul (387, 3; 500, 11), but in the direction of the will toward the finite and its pleasure therein (476, 19; 674, 17). The possibility of sin, however, is based in finiteness, taken together with the free will of the creature. If it is the destiny of the soul to be the resting-place of God, then the direction of the will toward the finite makes this impossible; and it is this that constitutes sin. Redemption, therefore, can take place only when the creature makes room in his soul for the work of God; and the condition for that is the turning away from the finite. For God is ever ready to work in the soul, provided he is not hindered and the soul is susceptible to his influence (27, 25; 283, 23; 33, 29; 479, 31). The inner separation from everything casual, sensual, earthly and the yielding to the work of God in the heart,—that is the seclusion or tranquillity of which Eckhart speaks again and again. For him this is the basis of all piety. But what is it that God accomplishes in the soul? This can be stated in a word: the birth of the son. As the soul is an image of the Deity, if it is to fulfil its destiny, then that process by which the deity develops into the three persons must take place in it. The father procreates in the soul the son (44, 28; 175, 15–20; 479, 10; 13, 12). This takes place during the life of the soul in time; and, too, not merely at a particular moment, but rather continuously and repeatedly. This is not merely a copy or analogon of that inner divine process, but is in truth that very process itself, by which it becomes, through grace, what the Son of God is by nature (433, 32; 382, 7; 377, 17). From this view of Eckhart's follow a number of the most striking statements in which the soul is made to share in the attributes and works of God, including the creation (119, 28–40; 267, 4; 283, 37–284, 7). However, according to Eckhart, a complete fusion of the soul with the Deity never takes place (387, 3). He also opposes the doctrine of Apocatastasis (65, 20; 402, 34; 470, 22).

5. Sin and Redemption.

According to Eckhart sin is not the real cause of the incarnation (591, 34). God wished rather to receive the nature of things through grace in time just as he had them by nature in eternity in himself (574, 34). Just as a man occupies a central position in the world, since he leads all creatures back to God, so Christ stands in the center of humanity (180, 7; 390, 37.) The same thought is found in Maximus the Confessor and Erigena, but whence did Eckhart get it? Even at the creation of the first man Christ was already the end in view (250, 23); and now after the fact of sin, Christ stands likewise in the center of redemption. After the fall all creatures worked together to produce a man who should restore the harmony (497, 11). This took place when Mary resigned herself so completely to the divine word that the eternal word could assume human nature in her. However, this temporal birth of the son is again included in his eternal birth as a moment of the same (391, 20). And now God is to be born in us. In his human life Jesus becomes a pattern for man; and in all that he did and experienced, above all in his passion and death there is an overwhelming power that draws man to God (218–219) and brings about in us that which first took place in Christ, who alone is the way to the father (241, 17).

6. The Place of Christ.

Whatever one may think of Eckhart's philosophical and dogmatic speculations, his ethical view, at any rate, is of rare purity and sublimity. The inner position of man, the disposition of the heart, is for him the main thing (56, 39; 297, 11; 444, 8; 560, 43) and with him this is not a result of reflection. One feels that it comes from the core of his personality; and no doubt this was the principal reason for the deep impression his sermons made. He speaks little of church ceremonies. For him outward penances have only a limited value. That man inwardly turn to God and be led by him,—that is the main purpose of Eckhart's exhortations. Let no one think because this or that great saint has done and suffered many things, that he should imitate him. God gives to each his task, and leaves every one on his way (560 sqq. 177, 26–35). No one can express the fact more definitely than does Eckhart, that it is not works that justify man, but that man must first be righteous in order to do righteous works. Nor does he recommend that one flee from the world, but flee from oneself, from selfishness, and self-will. Otherwise one finds as little peace in the cell as outside of it. Though he sees in suffering the most effective and most valuable means of inner purification, still he does not mean that one should seek sufferings of his own choosing, but only bear patiently whatever God imposes. He recognizes that it is natural for one to be affected either pleasantly or unpleasantly by the various sense-impressions; but in the innermost depths of the soul one must hold fast to God and allow himself to be moved by nothing (52, 1; 427, 22). It need hardly be added that he regards highly works of charity. Even supreme rapture should not prevent one from rendering a service to the poor. It is noteworthy that, in the ninth sermon, he puts Martha higher than Mary, though by a strange misinterpretation of the text. While Mary enjoyed only the sweetness of the Lord, being yet a learner, Martha had passed this stage. She stood firm in the substance, and no work hindered her, but every work helped her to blessedness.

7. Eckhart's Ethics.

Future investigations will presumably make possible a more accurate estimate of the importance of Eckhart; but it is hardly possible that they will overthrow the verdict of Suso and Tauler concerning him.

S. M. Deutsch.

Bibliography: J. Trittenheim, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, ch. 537, Basel, 1494; Franz von Baader, *Werke*, Leipsic, 1851–60, cf. Index; K. Schmidt, *Meister Eckart* in *TSK*, xi (1839), 663 sqq.; H. Martensen, *Meister Eckart*, Hamburg, 1842; F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker*, vol. ii., *Meister Eckart*, Stuttgart, 1857; Max Müller, *Theosophie oder psychologische Religion*, pp. 503–518, Leipsic, 1859; C. Greith, *Die deutsche Mystik im Predigerorden*, Freiburg, 1861; J. Bach, *Meister Eckhart, der Vater der deutschen Speculation*, Vienna, 1864; W. Preger, *Ein neuer Traktat Meister Eckarts*, in *ZHT*, 1864, 163–

204; A. Lasson, *Meister Eckart der Mystiker*, Berlin, 1868 (still important); W. Preger, *Meister Eckart und die Inquisition*, Munich, 1868; A. Jundt, *Essai sur le mysticisme spéculatif de Maître Eckhart*, Strasburg, 1871 (to be consulted with Lasson); W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter*, i. 309–458, Leipsic, 1874 (to be used with caution); A. Jundt, *Histoire du panthéisme populaire au moyen âge*, pp. 57–93, Paris, 1875; M. Rieger, in W. Wackernagel's *Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete*, pp. 398–429, Basel, 1876; R. Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii. 23–31, Edinburgh, 1877; R. C. Eucken, *Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie*, pp. 118–122, Leipsic, 1879; H. Denifle, *Meister Eckarts lateinische Schriften und die Grundanschauung seiner Lehre* in *ALKG*, ii (1886), 417–615, and supplement, 616–640; idem, *Das cusanische Exemplar lateinischer Schriften Eckarts*, ib. 673–678; idem, *Die Heimat Meister Eckarts*, ib. v (1889), 349–364; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, pp. 188–213, 8th ed., London, n.d.; Neander, *tian Church*, v. 393–396.

ECKHART THE YOUNGER. See MYSTICISM.

ECLECTICISM (from Gk. *eklegein*, "to gather"): A term applied to a system of philosophy or theology that strives to incorporate the truth of all systems, or to the method by which such a synthesis is made. In philosophy the best example of eclecticism is found in the Neoplatonism of the Alexandrine School, while among modern eclectics Leibnitz and Cousin may be mentioned. Since an eclectic system is necessarily a loose piece of mosaic work, rather than an organized body of original thought, the term in philosophy has come to be one of reproach. In theology eclecticism first appeared at Alexandria. Typical examples of eclectics are Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Synesius, who drew from classical and pagan, as well as from Christian sources.

ECSTASY: A state of mental exaltation in which the patient is supposed to be in intimate communion with the divine. The term connotes a large variety of phenomena, real or pretended, natural or evoked, which occur in connection with religious practises. The external phenomena may take either of two characters, intense vigor of physical action in which more than normal endurance or strength is shown, or a passivity which may reach the extreme of catalepsy. Not infrequently the second condition succeeds the first. During both stages the patient is insensible to pain, and often maims or wounds himself or performs feats at other times impossible to him. The condition includes the prophetic frenzy (*mania*, see DIVINATION) of the Greek Pythia and of the early Hebrew and heathen seers, the exaltation of the Mohammedan dervishes, the absorbed condition of Hindu devotees, and in its extreme development takes the form of catalepsy. It may be an unpremeditated result of strong emotion, or it may be induced. In the latter case, among both primitive and developed peoples, it is sought without intent to deceive or defraud, being prized as an especial mark of Deity's favor. It is affected by the shamans, medicine men, and wizards of such tribes as the Tasmanians, Karens, Zulus, Patagonians, Hawaiians and North American Indians, especially when engaged in divination; and also by the lay members of such tribes during their religious exercises. One of the six systems of Hindu philosophy has as its direct object the attainment of this condition. In Christian lands it is often an accompaniment of the religious excitement attending revivals and camp-meetings. When induced by direct effort, the chief means are the religious dance or music, or the two combined; but among more advanced peoples solitary contemplation or physical discipline are also used.

General Characteristics.

The phenomena of ecstasy have left marked traces upon Old and New Testament conceptions, especially in connection with prophecy, and its manifestations are often indicated by the use of the phrase "and the spirit of the Lord [Yahweh] came upon him." In the Old Testament the passage which best describes the condition is Num. xxiv., in which the staring eye (cf. verses 3, 15 R. V. margin) and the epileptic or cataleptic fall (verse 16) tally closely with the manifestations elsewhere observed. Balaam's oracles are pictured as delivered while he was in the ecstatic state, in accordance with the usual phase of prophecy in primitive religion. Gideon is represented as coming into this condition (Judges vi. 34), so also Jephthah (Judges xi. 29) and Samson (Judges xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14), in all these cases the results being much like those of the "berserker rage" of the early Norsemen. The ecstatic condition appears to have been normal to the prophetic gilds of the period of the Judges and the early kingdom, and for the first time in I Sam. x. 5–10, xix. 20–24 the contagiousness of the condition comes to light, in the case of Saul. Not to be overlooked here is the accompaniment of music and dancing which, with the character of the ensuing phenomena, makes the diagnosis certain. The Baal-prophets in I Kings xviii. 26–28, exhibit characteristic features of the frenzy of ecstasy. The prophecy of Elisha recorded in II Kings iii. 14–19 was given under conditions like that of Balaam, induced by music. That "madness" was ascribed to the prophets as a class (II Kings ix. 11) shows what were the characteristic methods of prophecy at that time. Possibly the "chirping and muttering" of Isa. viii. 19 refers to the utterances of ecstasy. The phenomena of the New Testament at Pentecost (Acts ii. 4), the case of Stephen (Acts vii. 55–56), and of Paul (Acts ix. 3 sqq.; II Cor. xii. 1–4) are psychologically explicable as cases of ecstasy. See INSPIRATION, § 1.

Biblical Examples.

In post-Biblical times the high estimate of the value of the ecstatic state continued. The Neoplatonic school of philosophy, following Plato himself, placed a high value upon the condition, and Plotinus and Porphyry laid emphasis upon its worth. The Montanistic theory of prophecy necessitated the entire passivity of the prophet in ecstasy. Mohammed's visions are to be explained from this standpoint, and it is to be noted in his case that epileptic symptoms, now regarded by psychologists as a predisposing cause, were manifested from his childhood. The transmissibility of this affection was manifested on a large scale in the Tarantism and Dancing Mania of the Middle Ages (See DANCERS) which involved a large area of Central Europe and thousands of suf-

Post-Biblical Cases.

ferers. That the visions of many of the saints, such as those of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Theresa, are traceable to this cause is highly probable. Böhme claimed the gift. Bonaventura's *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* aims to mark the steps by which the soul comes in ecstasy into the presence of God. The story of Joan of Arc, with its details of phenomena which seemed to the times to savor of witchcraft, becomes intelligible with ecstasy as the key to the mystery. The unrestrained actions manifested at periods of revival, especially in colored communities, reveal both the effects of abnormal excitement on individuals and the communicability to large numbers of this psychological affection. It is noticeable that the frequency of the affection diminishes before the advance of culture, that the educated are less liable to its attacks, and that emotional peoples and individuals are the most exposed. GEO. W. GILMORE.

Originally the word "ecstasy" signified the passage of the soul from the body, involving as a complementary conception its absorption into the Godhead. A further Greek term employed to express the state is *enthousiasmus*, and it implies the possession of man by deity. Early Christian literature uses several terms to carry the idea, such as *theophoros* (Ignatius, Epist. to Ephesians, ix. 2), *entheos* (idem, Epist. to Trallians, viii. 2), *pneumatophoros* (Hermas, Mandates, xi. 16). The word "enthusiasm" received a bad sense at the time of the Reformation, as when Luther spoke of the papacy as "a vain enthusiasm" and when he called Zwingli an enthusiast, and the same term is applied in documents of the Reformation to heretics (G. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, part ii., index, and xvi. 357). The phenomena of ecstatic enthusiasm were not uncommon in the later Jewish period, continued from the time of the New Testament, were frequent in the second century, but fell into discredit through the excesses of Montanism. The ecstatic state is discussed by early writers, such as Miltiades, Tertullian, and Augustine. The last-named defines it as "an alienation of the mind from the bodily senses, so that the spirit of man being taken possession of by the divine spirit is free for taking and receiving visions" (*MPL*, xl. 129); he was influenced by Neoplatonism in his attitude toward it. Dionysius the Areopagite goes so far as to speak of ecstasy on the part of God (*MPG*, iii. 712A). The development of monasticism gives frequent examples of the phenomenon. Tendencies of the same sort appear in modern Russian sects and in the monastic orders of the Eastern Church. The history of the saints and of heretics affords frequent instances of persons affected by the tendency who see visions and work wonders. The Reformers were firmly opposed to the "fanaticism" which, they claimed, was exhibited among the Anabaptists, Mennonites, and other sects. The exhibitions continued in the later Roman Catholic Church, e.g., Marie Alacoque, and among Protestants, in the case of the Camisards. Although the eighteenth century was especially unsympathetic toward any type of irrationalism in religion, Goethe defended "enthusiasm," and Kant discussed the subject, while Wieland doubted whether the strict philosophical attitude could be justified (Hempel's ed. of his "Works," xxxii. 369 sqq.). The reviews of the subject by Herder and Lessing reached a rather unfavorable conclusion (Herder's "Works," xx. 277 sqq.; Lessing's "Works," ed. Lachmann, xvi. 293 sqq.). The romantic movement of the nineteenth century was rather more favorable, especially in the discussions of about 1830–40. Examples were seen in the frequent Madonna visions and stigmatizations in the Roman Catholic Church. Among Protestants they were connected with the movements of Pietism and Methodism of the last two centuries, and the record is maintained at the present in accounts of visions of Christ, in speaking with tongues, and in religious healing of disease.

General Review.

The internal working of God's spirit in the individual soul is a certainty, however it may be interpreted in terms of objective reality. It may take the position of historic revelation, but in its influence on the development of the Christian Church it may be distinguished as a kind of secondary revelation. To distinguish between the sound and the unsound in even the derived form is impossible where the emotional and practical sides of religion are concerned. The tendency in modern times is to take an unfavorable view and to label all types of enthusiasm as fanaticism. Modern enthusiasm reveals itself in five particulars: the insistence upon the necessity for new revelations, in a belief in predictive powers, in methods of Christian healing as by the laying on of hands and prayer, in ascetic methods of attaining sanctification, and in millenarian views. (KARL THIEME.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Goerres, *Die christliche Mystik*, Munich, 1836–42; M. Perty, *Die mystische Erscheinungen der menschlichen Natur*, Leipsic, 1864; J. H. Fichte, *Psychologie*, pp. 588–655, ib. 1864; F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, pp. 354–368, 418–433, Edinburgh, 1867; A. Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 86, London, 1871; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 123, 436, ii. 130–131, 410, Boston, 1874; Charbonnier de Batty, *Les Maladies des mystiques*, Paris, 1875; H. Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, i. 254, 274 sqq., Edinburgh, 1892; W. Walther, *Das Zeugnis des heiligen Geistes nach Luther und nach moderner Schwärmerei*, Leipsic, 1899; T. Achelis, *Die Ekstase in ihrer kulturellen Bedeutung*, Berlin, 1902; C. A. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, §§ 5, 7, New York, 1902; W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, London, 1902; E. Murisièr, *Les Maladies du sentiment religieux*, pp. 7–72, Paris, 1903; P. Beck, *Die Ekstase. Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie und Völkerkunde*, Bad Sachsa, 1906.

ECTENE, ec'ten-î *or* -ê (late Gk. *ektenē* [*euchē*], "earnest prayer"; cf. *proseuchē ektenēs*, "prayer without ceasing," Acts xii. 5): A prayer in the form of a litany which occurs in the liturgy and other public functions of the Eastern Church. It consists of a varying number of short petitions said by the deacon, to which the choir or congregation respond with *Kyrie eleison*, or in the supplicatory one with "Grant us, O Lord." All forms end with a request for the intercession of the Virgin and all the saints, followed by an ascription of praise to the Holy Trinity.

ECUADOR: South American republic, so called because it is crossed by the equator; area about 120,000 sq. m.; population about 1,400,000, of which 700,000 are Indians, 500,000 of Spanish descent, and 200,000 negroes and of mixed blood;

there are only 100,000 pure whites in the country. The established religion is Roman Catholicism, which is recognized by the constitution of the republic, to the exclusion of every other confession. However, toleration is shown to foreigners of other confessions; but these, few in number, have never founded an independent congregation. The Church is organized into the archbishopric of Quito (bishopric 1545, archbishopric since 1848), the six bishoprics of Cuenca (1786), Guayaquil (1837), Ibarra (1862), Loja (1866), Porto Vecchio (1871), and Riobamba (1863), and an apostolical vicariate at Nopo. The entire territory is divided into 350 parishes, in which are also the cloisters of ten different orders of monks and eleven orders of nuns. The relations of Church to State are regulated by the concordat of 1862, as changed in 1881, which also regulates the receipts of the Church in the several provinces. In general, education, though nominally compulsory, is neglected. Besides a fair number of elementary schools there are nine national colleges, five girls' schools conducted by nuns, a number of seminaries of the clergy, and an old and unimportant university at Quito, with branches at Cuenca and Guayaquil. The Indians in the east, among whom many missions were established by the Jesuits, also by the Franciscans, prior to the separation of South America from Spain, have been allowed to relapse completely into their original state of barbarity. Their religion is fetishism of the crudest variety.

WILHELM GOETZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the country: T. C. Dawson, *The South American Republics*, part 2, New York, 1904; A. Simson, *Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador*, London, 1887; T. Wolf, *Geographia y geológia del Ecuador*, Leipsic, 1892; W. Sievers, *Amerika*, ib. 1893. On the relations of the Church of Rome: *El Concordato i la esposicion del concejo cantonal de Guayaquil*, Guayaquil, 1863 (Concordat between Pius IX. and President Moreno); *Nueva version del concordato de 1862 . entre . Leon XIII. y el presidente . del Ecuador*, Quito, 1882. Consult also J. Lee, *Religious Liberty in South America with Special Reference to Recent Legislation in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia*, Cincinnati, 1907.

EDDY, MARY BAKER GLOVER: Founder of "Christian Science"; b. at Bow, near Concord, N. H., July 16, 1821. Her maiden name was Mary Ambrose Morse Baker; she is of Scotch-English extraction, and numbers among her ancestors a member of the Provincial Congress and soldiers in the war of the Revolution. She received her education at an academy at Tilton, N. H., and from private tutors. Her first church connection was with the Congregational Church at Tilton, which she joined July 26, 1838. She married George Washington Glover, a bricklayer, in Dec., 1843, and went with him to his home in Wilmington, S. C., where she was left a widow in June, 1844, and returned to New Hampshire soon after, where her only child, George Washington Glover, was born in Sept. of the same year. In 1853 she married Daniel Patterson (d. 1896), a dentist, from whom she obtained a divorce in 1873 on the ground of desertion. From childhood she had been weakly in constitution and subject at times to violent hysteria, and in 1862 she came into touch with Phineas Parkhurst Quimby (d. Jan. 16, 1866), a healer who after various experiments believed that he had discovered in mental control the secret of Christ's power of healing, and had spoken of his system as "Science of health (and happiness)," "Science of Christ," and once or twice as "Christian Science." She believed herself healed, and after 1864 began to practise his system on herself and others, then to give instruction in the methods of treatment to others. The first attempt at an organization to embody her principles was made at Lynn in 1875. She was married to Asa Gilbert Eddy Jan. 1, 1877 (d. 1888). The Church of Christ, Scientist, later known as the "mother church," was organized by her in Boston in 1879. She also founded the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, which received its charter in 1881, and in 1883 established the *Christian Science Journal*. For the wide-spread denomination founded by her see SCIENCE, CHRISTIAN. She has written *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* (the text-book of her system; many subsequent editions; Boston, 1875); *Christian Healing* (1886); *People's Idea of God* (1886); *Unity of Good* (1891); *Rudimental Divine Science* (1891); *No and Yes* (1891); *Retrospection and Introspection* (1892); *Manual* (1895); *Miscellaneous Writings* (1896); *Christ and Christmas* (1897); *Pulpit and Press* (1898); *Christian Science versus Pantheism* (1898); *Message to the Mother Church* (1900); *Our Leader's Message* (1901); and *Truth versus Error* (1905).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Brisbane, *Mary Baker G. Eddy*, Boston, 1908.

EDDY, RICHARD: Universalist; b. at Providence, R. I., June 21, 1828; d. at Gloucester, Mass., Aug. 16, 1906. He was graduated at Clinton Theological Seminary, Clinton, N. Y., in 1849, became chaplain of the Sixtieth New York State Volunteers 1861–63, and was lecturer on the history of Universalism at Tuft's College 1882–83 and on the dogmatic history of Universalism at the same institution in 1902 and at St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y., in 1906. In theology he based his belief in universal salvation on the will, purpose, and pleasure of God and the mission of Christ, as well as on his acceptance of the doctrine of the remedial character of punishment and the ever-enduring freedom of the human will. He edited the *Universalist Quarterly Review* 1888–94 and the *Universalist Register* (the year-book of the denomination) after 1888, and wrote *The History of the Sixtieth Regiment New York State Volunteers* (Philadelphia, 1864); *History of Universalism in America* (2 vols., Boston, 1883–85); *Alcohol in History* (New York, 1888); *Alcohol in Society* (1890); *Universalism in Gloucester, Mass.* (Gloucester, Mass., 1894); *History of Universalism* (1894); and *Life of Thomas J. Sawyer* (Boston, 1904).

EDELMANN, ē'del-mān, **JOHANN CHRISTIAN:** German rationalist; b. at Weissenfels (20 m. s.w. of Leipsic) July 9, 1698; d. at Berlin Feb. 15, 1767. In 1720 he began the study of theology at Kiel, but even before his examination at Eisenach in 1724 he had secretly determined to renounce the ministry. His personal experiences among Roman Catholics and Pietists enlarged his views but turned him more and more from Christianity. Wherever he went

he antagonized those whom he had hoped to win, and he successively abandoned the Moravians, the mystic separatists of Berleburg, and the Huguenot Inspired at Homburghausen, finally living as an individualistic separatist. His interpretation of the Johannine "The Word was God" as "God is reason" made his way clear before him. Henceforth, financially aided by his friends, he began to write in propaganda of his convictions, his works including *Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht* (Berleburg, 1740); *Die Göttlichkeit der Vernunft* (1741); *Die Begierde nach der vernünftigen lautern Milch* (Hachenburg, 1744); *Glaubensbekenntnis* (Neuwied, 1746), and *Das Evangelium St. Harenbergs* (Altona, 1748). Edelmann met with opposition everywhere, until Frederic II. allowed him to live at Berlin on condition that he publish nothing more. He accordingly engaged in private literary work, which he continued until his death. Denying the validity of the Bible as a source of religious knowledge, Edelmann sought to base religion on nature and human thought, claiming that the world is a copy of the supramundane deity. This divinity is not actually transcendental, but the "living God is simply the uninterrupted existence and essence of all things themselves." He regarded all positive religions as imperfect forms of man's concept of his relation to the universe and consequently to God.

PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Edelmann's autobiography was edited by C. R. W Klose, Berlin, 1849. Consult: K. Guden, *Johann Christian Edelmann*, Hanover, 1870; J. H. Pratje, *Historische Nachrichten von J. C. Edelmanns Leben*, Hamburg, 1755; F. Mönckeberg, *Reimarus und Edelmann*, ib. 1867; B. Bauer, *Einfluss des englischen Quäkertums auf die deutsche Kultur*, Berlin, 1878; *ADB*, v. 639–640.

EDEN: According to Gen. ii. 8, Eden was the country where God "planted a garden," in which he placed the man "whom he had formed." It is therefore called the garden of God (Ezek. xxviii. 13, xxxi. 8, 9) or the garden of Yahweh (Isa. xi. 3), and is the very symbol of peace, for in it all animals which God had created lived on terms of friendship (Gen. ii. 19 sqq.) and the two human beings enjoyed uninterrupted communion with God (ii. 16, 22, iii. 8 sqq.). The garden was luxuriously furnished with vegetation (ii. 9), of which the fig-tree (iii. 7), the "tree of life," and the "tree of knowledge of good and evil" find special mention. It was man's duty to dress and keep the garden (ii. 15); here he named the animals (ii. 20), and here the woman was fashioned out of his "rib" (or "side," ii. 21, 22). Upon the pair, living in this felicity, was put but one prohibition,—that they should not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (ii. 17). Through the serpent's guile the woman was led to disobey this command (iii. 1–5) and the man yielded to her temptation and also ate of the fruit (iii. 6). Deprived by this act of their first innocence, they made for themselves aprons of fig leaves, and hid themselves from God (iii. 7, 8). Thereupon God cursed the serpent, but promised future victory for the human race,—the so-called protevangelium (iii. 15). But man was punished by being driven from the garden, that he might not eat of the tree of life and so live forever (iii. 22). At the east of the garden God placed the cherubim and a flaming sword, turning every way by its own motion, to keep the road to the tree of life (iii. 24).

The Description in Genesis.

Stories of an early period of innocence and happiness in the history of the human race are found among other peoples than the Hebrews. In India and Persia stories with marked superficial resemblances to the Genesis narrative have been found. When the Assyrian and Babylonian literature first began to be accessible many hoped that it would afford still closer parallels, as it ultimately did to the creation and flood narratives of Genesis. This hope was quickened by the discovery of a small cylinder seal, now in the British Museum, upon which were cut the figures of a male and female on opposite sides of a tree, with hands stretched toward it, while behind the female is an upright snake. But closer examination makes it doubtful whether this has any relationship to the Biblical temptation. The figures are clothed, and the male figure is certainly intended to represent a god, as it is provided with horns, and the female is quite probably intended to represent a goddess. What the serpent may mean is doubtful, though Jensen suggests it may represent a guardian. The meaning of the scene is likely to remain doubtful until the discovery of some written explanation of it in Babylonian mythology. The Babylonian legend of Adapa has been compared with the Biblical story, but the resemblance is not close. Adapa is the son of the god Ea, from whom he had received wisdom but not everlasting life. Adapa, who is a sort of half divine being, lives at Eridu as a local wise man, and priest of Ea's temple, to which it is his care to supply bread and water. While fishing one day in the Persian Gulf his boat was overturned by the south wind, whose wings Adapa at once broke in anger, so that for seven days it was not able to blow. Summoned before the god Anu to answer for this misdeed, Adapa was warned by Ea that Anu would offer him water of death and bread of death, both of which he must decline. Anu, however, relented and offered him bread of life and water of life, which Adapa declined and so missed his chance of eternal life.

Other Similar Stories.

The writer of the story of Eden evidently intended to convey a definite and exact idea of its location. He has described and named its rivers, and told what lands lay contiguous to them, and has even given the characteristics of these lands. But, explicit as he is, the identification of his details is so difficult that no consensus of opinion has been reached, nor does any seem to be in prospect. It would be almost safe to say that the views of the location of Eden are as numerous as the scholars who have investigated the problem. The earlier attempts at a solution may be passed by, as not conforming to geographical conditions as recent investigations have made them known; and the more or less eccentric views which would find the Biblical Paradise in Atlantis, Lemuria, or

Attempts to Locate Eden.

the North Pole, need only be mentioned. The suggestions which have found most approval in modern times are the following: (1) Eden was in the Far East. This view identifies the Pison with the Indus or Ganges, and Gihon with the Nile. The theory has several different forms, and in most of them can be regarded only as holding that Eden was in Utopia, the Land of the Golden Nowhere, for by no possibility can the Nile and the Indus or Ganges ever have been derived from one head. Some of the adherents of this view look upon the Genesis accounts as based upon ignorance of geographical facts or as wholly ideal. Delitzsch and Dillmann may be cited as the chief names in support of this hypothesis. The former says: "The inspiration of the Biblical writers did not, in matters of natural knowledge, raise them above the level of their age; it need, therefore, cause no surprise if the Biblical representation of Paradise bears marks of the imperfect geographical knowledge of the ancients." (2) Eden was near Eridu in southern Babylonia. This view based partly on the investigations of Eduard Glaser has been propounded and supported with ingenuity and learning by Fritz Hommel. He identifies the rivers Pison, Gihon, and Hiddekel with three wadies in northern Arabia, named respectively the Wady Dawasir, the Wady Rumma and the Wady Sirhan. But these are dry valleys and not rivers, and the identification is in other respects not easily reconciled with the Genesis statements. (3) Eden was in northern Babylonia near the city of Babylon. This location was first suggested by Friedrich Delitzsch in 1881. According to him Eden was the whole plain of Babylonia, and Paradise was located where the Tigris and Euphrates most nearly approach each other. The river Pison is the great canal Pallakopas, running west and south of the Euphrates (Assyrian *pisanu* = river bed) and the Gihon with the canal Shatt al-Nil, which runs east from the Euphrates from Babylon and rejoins it near Ur. On the whole this theory seems best to meet the conditions laid down in Genesis, but its acceptance among scholars has not been general. (4) Quite recently the view advocated by Gunkel that the original Eden was in heaven and the rivers are represented by the Milky Way and its four arms has found support among certain scholars. Upon this theory the earthly Eden is but a reflection and so may have been located in several places by different peoples, as for example in Babylonia, or Arabia. See ADAM, II. ROBERT W ROGERS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature up to 1892 is in O. Zöckler, *Biblische und kirchenhistorische Studien*, v. 3 sqq., Munich, 1893, and in most of the commentaries on Genesis. Consult: Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* Leipsic, 1881 (a book of wide reputation); F. Spiegel, *Eranische Alterthumskunde*, i. 473 sqq., 522 sqq., ib. 1871; W. Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, ii. 189–190, ib. 1878; E. Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte . Arabiens*, ii. 323 sqq., 341 sqq., Berlin, 1890; P. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, Strasburg, 1890; idem, in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vi. 1, Berlin, 1900; C. H. Toy, in *JBL*, x (1891), 1–19; É. Nestle, *Marginalien und Materialen*, pp. 4–6, Tübingen, 1893; A. H. Sayce, *"Higher Criticism" and the Monuments*, pp. 95 sqq., London, 1894; A. Dillmann on Genesis in *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*, Leipsic, 1892, Eng. transl., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1897; F. Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, London, 1897; H. Gunkel, on Genesis in *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, Göttingen, 1901; E. C. Worcester, *Genesis in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, pp. 148–256, New York, 1901; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 520–530; *DB*, i. 643–644; *EB*, iii. 3569–3583; *JE*, v. 36–39.

EDEN, GEORGE RODNEY: Church of England bishop of Wakefield; b. at Sunderland (14 m. n.e. of Durham), Durham county, England, Sept. 9, 1853. He studied at Pembroke College, Cambridge (B.A., 1878), and became honorary fellow in 1903. He was ordered deacon in 1878 and ordained priest in 1879, and was assistant master of Aysgarth School, Yorkshire, 1878–79, domestic chaplain to Bishop Lightfoot of Durham 1879–83, and chaplain to Bishop Lightfoot and vicar of Auckland 1883–90. In 1890 he was consecrated bishop suffragan of Dover. He was also rural dean of Auckland from 1887 to 1890, and archdeacon and canon of Canterbury, as well as chaplain of the Cinque Ports, from 1892 to 1897. He was select preacher at Cambridge in 1886, 1890, 1892, and 1894, and at Oxford in 1899–1900. In 1897 he was translated to the see of Wakefield. In theology he has sympathy for many varieties of opinion—High, Broad, and Low Church—within the Church in so far as they are compatible with loyalty to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

EDERSHEIM, ē'ders-hīm, **ALFRED:** Biblical scholar; b. at Vienna Mar. 7, 1825; d. at Menton, France, Mar. 16, 1889. He was of Jewish parentage, and received his earliest education in a gymnasium of his native city and in the *talmud torah* attached to a Viennese synagogue. In 1841 he continued his studies at the University of Vienna, but left it before taking his degree on account of the financial reverses of his father. Going to Pesth as a teacher of languages, he came under the influence of John Duncan, a Scotch Presbyterian chaplain to workmen engaged in constructing a bridge over the Danube, and was converted to Christianity. Edersheim accompanied Duncan on his return to Scotland and studied theology at New College, Edinburgh, and at the University of Berlin. In 1846 he was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. He was for a year a missionary to the Jews at Jassy, Rumania, and on his return to Scotland, after preaching for a time in Aberdeen, was installed at the Free Church, Old Aberdeen, in 1849. In 1861 failing health forced him to resign and the Church of St. Andrew was built for him at Torquay. In 1872 his health again obliged him to retire, and for four years he lived quietly at Bournemouth. In 1875 he took orders in the Church of England, and was curate of the Abbey Church, Christchurch, Hants, for a year, and from 1876 to 1882 vicar of Loders, Dorsetshire, besides being Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn 1880–84. In 1882 he resigned his living and removed to Oxford. He was select preacher to the University 1884–85 and Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint 1886–88 and 1888–90. His works include *History of the Jewish Nation after the Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus* (Edinburgh, 1856); *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services at the Time of Jesus Christ* (London, 1874); *Bible History* (7 vols., 1876–87); *Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ* (1876);

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (2 vols., 1883; condensation in one volume, 1890), his greatest work; and *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah* (Warburton Lectures for 1880–1884, 1885); *Tohu-va-Vohu, "Without form and Void." A Collection of fragmentary Thoughts and Criticisms. Ed. with a Memoir, by Ella Edersheim* (1890).

EDESSA: An important city of Northern Mesopotamia. It is located on the Daisan, an eastern tributary of the Euphrates, nearly midway between Diarbekir and Aleppo on the straight line which joins them, in 37° 21′ n. lat., and 39° 6′ e. long. The Targum of pseudo-Jonathan, Jerome, and Ephraem Syrus wrongly identified the city with the Erech of Gen. x. 10, and this may be reflected in the Arabic tradition which connects the place with the death of Abraham, after whom the principal mosque of the city is called. The early name is unknown. The city came into historical prominence as a part of the Greek empire in the time of Seleucus, who possibly renamed it after the Macedonian Edessa, though an etymological suggestion is that Edessa is a corruption of the Syriac *Haditha*, "New City." By the Greeks it was also called Callirrhoe (doubtless from its fountain), whence came the Syrian name Urhoi, the Arabic el-Roha, and the Turkish Urfa.

Edessa remained theoretically a city of the Seleucid kingdom till 136 B.C., when it became the capital of the Osrohenic (Chosroenic) kingdom founded by Osrhoes (Orhoi bar-Khevyo), among whose succcssors was Abgar (q.v.), famous for the alleged correspondence with our Lord (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, I., xxiii. sqq.). It was plundered by Trajan's general Lucius Quietus, 116 A.D., and the kingdom was madc tributary to the Romans, though its independence was restored by Hadrian, probably the following year. In 217 its autonomy was ended by Caracalla, and a Roman colony was established there. During the next century it suffered severely in the wars between Romans and Persians, and it was visited by Julian, who proposed to distribute the wealth of the native Christians and churches among his soldiers. In 609 the Persians were in possession, and in 641 the Mohammedans took it. It was captured in the crusade under Godfrey of Bouillon in 1097 and remained in Christian hands till 1144, when it again became a Moslem possession. In 1234 it belonged to the Byzantines, Tamerlane took it in 1393, and the Turks in 1637.

The city was early a seat of Christianity, and an untrustworthy tradition attributes the introduction of the religion to Thaddeus (see JUDAS) or to Addai, alleged to be one of the Seventy sent by Thomas the Apostle (see ABGAR, and cf. *Acta Thaddæi*, APOCRYPHA, B, II., 12). This Syrian tradition makes Addai the first bishop, and his immediate successors Aggæus and Barsimæus. The first Christian church built there is said to have been destroyed by a flood in 202 A.D., which testifies to the early establishment of Christianity there. In the third century it was the seat of a bishop, and in the fourth was a city of monasteries as well as the chief seat of Syrian Christian learning with its famous schools whence issued a long line of famous scholars. Ephraem Syrus made it his home, and Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.*, vi. 18) affirms that in the time of Valens (363–378) most of the inhabitants were Christians. The type of Christianity seems to have changed from orthodox to Arian and later to Nestorian. Under Diocletian it appears to have been the scene of many martyrdoms, and under Sapor II. of Persia the Christians there suffered severe persecutions. It is still the seat of an Armenian archbishop, and it gives the name to a titular Roman Catholic archbishopric. Its present population is estimated at between 30,000 and 50,000, nearly all Mohammedans, with about 2,000 Armenian Christians and about 500 Jews.

GEO. W GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The basal source for the early history is the *Chronicon Edessenum*, ed. I. Guidi, in Syriac and Latin, 1903, also in J. S. Asseman, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 388–417, Rome, 1719; consult also T. L. Bayer, *Hist. Osrhoena et Edessena ex nummis illustrata*, St. Petersburg, 1734. The Christian sources are indicated in the text in the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, I. xiii. sqq., Sozomen, iii. 14, 16, and Socrates, iv. 18. Consult further: L. J. Tixeront, *Les Origines de l'église d'Édesse*, Paris, 1888; A. Buffa, *La Légende d'Abgar et les origines de l'église d'Édesse*, Geneva, 1893; F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, chap. i, London, 1904.

EDIFICATION (Gk., *oikodomē*, "building up," *oikodomein*, *ekoikodomein*, "to build up"): In a metaphorical sense a term peculiar to Christianity, occurring in the New Testament, in Matt. xvi. 18; Acts ix. 31, xx. 32; I Pet. ii. 5; Jude 20, and especially in Paul. The notion goes back to the conception of the congregation (Eph. ii. 21–22; I Cor. iii. 9, 16) and the individual Christian (I Cor. vi. 19; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17) as the "temple of God"; but it transcends the literal significance of the word in so far as the subject in whom the edification takes place receives his origin through edification in the literal sense, but in the metaphysical sense is already in existence before the edification (so in I Pet. ii. 5). Pagans are not "built up" to a congregation of Christ, nor do individual Christians by their union "build up" the congregation, but the existing congregation of Christ is "built up" into the congregation of Christ, a member of the congregation into a member of the congregation of Christ, by edification the congregation and the individual Christian *becomes* that which it (or he) already is. By faith in Christ the congregation like the individual Christian has entered into the *status perfectionis;* more than the congregation of Christ it can not become as the individual Christian can not become more than a child of God. But the task is to become *perfectly* that which they are, and to realize fully the principle of the new life: the activity by which this is accomplished is "edification."

According to Matt. xvi. 18 Christ is the subject, and Christians as a whole are the object of the "edification"; according to Eph. iv. 16 Christians as a whole and according to Rom. xiv. 19 the individual congregation are the subject and object of the "edification;" according to I Cor. xiv. 4, "he that prophesieth," according to Eph. iv. 29 every Christian in every word is the subject and the congregation the object, of the "edification"; according to Rom. xv. (I Thess. v. 11; I Cor. xiv. 17) the

individual is to "edify" the individual; according to I Cor. xiv. 4, "he that speaketh in a tongue" "edifieth" himself (only). But whether the congregation edifies itself, or an individual the congregation, or another individual, or himself, the supreme subject of all "edification" is Christ the Lord, who exercises his edifying activity through his Gospel, through the gifts of his Spirit, through the new life (especially through love, I Cor. viii. 1), which he has awakened and preserves in his congregation. Christ himself leads his congregation and its individual members unto perfection.

E. C. Achelis.

EDMUND (EADMUND), SAINT, OF CANTERBURY (EDMUND RICH): Archbishop of Canterbury; b. at Abingdon (7 m. s. of Oxford), Berkshire, c. 1175; d. at Soisy-en-Brie (75 m. s.e. of Paris), France, Nov. 16, 1240 or 1242. He studied at the universities of Oxford and Paris and became a teacher about 1200, or a little earlier. For six years he lectured on mathematics and dialectics, apparently dividing his time between Oxford and Paris, and winning distinction for his part in introducing the study of Aristotle. Through the influence of a pious mother he had led from boyhood a life of singular self-denial and austerity; and it is not surprising to find him tiring of secular subjects and ready to go over to theology. Though for some time he resisted the change, he finally entered upon his new career between 1205 and 1210. He received ordination, took a doctorate in divinity, and soon won fame as a lecturer on theology and as an extemporaneous preacher. After expounding the "Lord's Law" for a number of years, Edmund became disgusted with scholasticism and gave up his chair at Oxford. Some time between 1219 and 1222 he was appointed treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral, and held this position for eleven years, during which time he also engaged in preaching. In 1227, at the bidding of Innocent III., he preached the sixth crusade through a large part of England.

In 1233 came the news of his appointment, by Gregory IX., to the archbishopric of Canterbury. The chapter had already made three selections which the pope had declined to confirm, and Edmund's name had been proposed as a compromise by Gregory, perhaps on account of his work for the crusade, and he was consecrated Apr. 2, 1234. Before his consecration he allied himself with the national party, whose object was to make the kingdom independent, maintain the Great Charter and exclude foreigners from civil and ecclesiastical office, and in the name of his fellow bishops he admonished Henry III. at Westminster, Feb. 2, 1234, to take warning of his father, King John. A week after his consecration he again appeared before the king with the barons and bishops, this time threatening his sovereign with excommunication, if he refused to dismiss his councilors, particularly Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester. This threat was sufficient. The objectionable favorites were dismissed; and soon the archbishop was sent to Wales to negotiate peace with Prince Llewellyn.

In 1237, in order to destroy the authority of Edmund, Henry induced the pope to send Cardinal Otto as legate to England. Through numerous disputes with bishops and monks, not to speak of the rupture with the king, and the excommunication of Simon de Montfort and his bride, Edmund had already made his position a difficult one. As the champion of the national Church against the claims of Rome he now found himself arrayed against the pope. In Dec., 1237, he set out for Rome, hoping to enlist the pope on the side of ecclesiastical reform. From this futile mission he returned to England in Aug., 1238, to find himself reduced to a cipher. If he excommunicated his monks, they appealed to Rome and paid no attention to his interdict. Finding himself foiled at every turn he finally submitted to the papal demands; and early in 1240, hoping to win his cause against his monks, he paid to the pope's agents one fifth of his revenue, which had been levied for the pope's war against Emperor Frederick II. Other English prelates followed his example. Then came the demand that 300 English benefices should be assigned to as many Romans. This attack upon the rights of the national Church was more than Edmund could endure. In the summer of 1240, broken in spirit, he retired to the abbey of Pontigny, France, which had been the refuge of his predecessors, St. Thomas and Stephen Langton. A few months later he died at the priory of Soisy. In less than a year after his death miracles were alleged to be wrought at his grave; and in 1247 he was canonized.

Edmund is one of the most attractive figures of medieval history. His life was one of self-sacrifice and devotion to others. From boyhood he practised asceticism; and throughout his life he wore sackcloth next his skin, pressed against his body by metal plates. After snatching a few hours' sleep without removing his clothing, he usually spent the rest of the night in prayer and meditation. Besides his "Constitutions," issued in 1236 (printed in W. Lynwood's *Constitutiones Angliæ*, Oxford, 1679), he wrote *Speculum ecclesiæ* (London, 1521; Eng. transl., 1527; reprinted in M. de la Bigne's *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, v., Paris, 1609).

Bibliography: A *Vita* by Bertrand of Pontigny, with *Epistolæ variæ* and other pertinent material is in E. Martène, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, iii. 1775–1826, Paris, 1717; another, by his brother, Robert Rich of Pontigny, is in L. Surius, *Vitæ sanctorum*, Nov., vi. 366–376, Paris, 1575 and is also in W. Wallace, *Life of St. Edmund of Canterbury*, London, 1893. Sources of knowledge are the works of Matthew of Paris, ed. H. R. Luard, no. 57 of the *Rolls Series*, vols. iii.–v.; *Annales monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, no. 36 of *Rolls Series*, 4 vols.; Gervase of Canterbury, ed. W. Stubbs, no. 71 of *Rolls Series*, vol. ii. MS. material is indicated in T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue*, no. 26 of *Rolls Series*, iii. 87–96; while documents of value are given in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 463, 465. Modern accounts, besides the work of Wallace, ut sup., are: W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. iii., 12 vols., London, 1860–76; E. Jaspar, *Notice biographique sur S. Edmond*, Lille, 1872; L. F. Masse, *The Life of S. Edmond of Canterbury*, London, 1874; ib. 1897; F. de Paravicini, *Life of St. Edmund of Abingdon*, ib. 1898; W. R. W. Stephens, *The English Church 1066–1272*, pp. 228–233, 277, ib. 1901; *DNB*, xvi. 405–410.

EDMUND (EADMUND), SAINT, THE MARTYR: Last king of the East Angles; b. in Nuremberg 841, the son of King Alkmund; killed by the Danes near Hoxne (25 m. n. of Ipswich), Suffolk,

Nov. 20, 870. As the adopted son of Offa, the East Anglian king, he succeeded that monarch Dec. 25, 855. It was the time of the Danish incursions in England. In 870 a formidable band of the heathen attacked East Anglia, and according to the not altogether trustworthy accounts, Edmund determined to sacrifice himself in the hope of saving his people. He was bound to a tree, tortured, and finally beheaded. His remains were interred at Hoxne for thirty-three years and then deposited at the town now known as Bury St. Edmunds, where Canute built a magnificent church and abbey in his honor in 1020. Whether Edmund was ever formally canonized is doubtful, but miracles were attributed to him soon after his death, his shrine was long one of the most frequented resorts of English pilgrims, and his sainthood was unquestioned in the popular estimation. His piety, meekness, and benevolence are highly extolled and it is said that he shut himself up in his tower at Hunstanton in Norfolk for an entire year to memorize the Psalter.

Bibliography: The *Passio sancti Edmundi*, by Abbo., ed. T. Arnold, is in *Rolls Series*, No. 96, London, 1890. Consult the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. B. Thorpe, in *Rolls Series*, No. 23, ib. 1861; *DNB*. xvi. 400–401.

EDOM, EDOMITES: The country known in the Old Testament principally as Edom (Hebr. *'Edhom*, Assyr. *Udumu* or *Udumi*, Egyptian *Aduma*) lay southeast of Palestine, and included the valley of the Arabah south of the Dead Sea, approximately 100 miles in length, and the mountain ranges which border it, with a somewhat indefinite extent of territory east and west, corresponding to the present al-Sherâ. In its greatest extent it reached north and south from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah, eastward to the Arabian desert, and westward to the desert of Sin (Josh. xv. 1). The name most probably means "Red (Land)," from the color of the sandstone cliffs which are a prominent feature of the topography. Other possibilities are that Edom is the name of a deity, or that it means "man (*par excellence*)," being connected with "Adam," the Bible name for the first man. The country is also known as Seir and Mount Seir (Heb. *Se'ir*, "hairy," possibly from the effect of the wooded or brushy crests of the mountains as seen from a distance, Gen. xxv. 25, 30, xxvii. 11, 23, xxxii. 3; Num. xxiv. 18; Deut. i. 44; and often); and, poetically, "the mountains of Esau" (Obad. 8–9, 19, 21). The later name was Idumea (Isa. xxxiv. 5–6; Ezek. xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 5; Mark iii. 8). The region is at present for the most part barren, though portions in the east are not only tillable but luxuriantly fertile. The valley has an elevation of 600 feet near the middle part of its length, and slopes northward down to the Dead Sea, and south to the eastern arm of the Red Sea. Among its cities were Maon (Judges x. 12), the present Ma'an; Punon or Pinon (Num. xxxiii. 42–43; cf. Gen. xxxvi. 41); Bozrah (Gen. xxxvi. 33, and often), probably the capital, the modern Buseirah; Selah or Petra (II Kings xiv. 7). Possibly Teman (Gen. xxxvi. 34; Jer. xlix. 7, 20; Amos i. 12; and often) was the name of a district, not of a city. An important feature of the country were the trade-routes which cut or skirted it, especially that from Damascus to the Red Sea, and the eastern and western road from Babylonia to Egypt.

The Country and its Names.

The Edomites belonged to the northern branch of the Semitic race, with the Moabites, Ammonites, and Hebrews constituting the Hebraic group. The Old Testament makes them descendants of Esau (who is as eponym given the name Edom because of his coloring; cf. Gen. xxv. 25), the elder brother of Jacob-Israel. This statement of the relationship of the two brothers is the expression of the consciousness in Israel of the earlier origin or crystallization into nationality of the Edomites. But the latter appear as the conquering invaders of the country, not as the autochthonous inhabitants, who are called "sons of Seir the Horite" or "Horites" (Gen. xxxvi. 2, 20; Deut. ii. 12, 22; cf. the Egyptian *Sa'aïra;* "Horites" probably means troglodytes; see Gezer; cf. the Egyptian designation of the people as *Ḥaru*), who are represented as continuing in the land, while the Egyptian reports of two peoples as "Beduin from Aduma" and *Sa'aïra* existing side by side east of Egypt corroborate the representation. According to Gen. xxxvi. 15–19 the Edomites were composed of thirteen clans; Gen. xxxvi. 40–43 implies only eleven. Gen. xxxvi. 31 names eight Edomitic kings; and Num. xx. 14 and Judges xi. 17 imply a kingdom as early as Moses. The people are described as hunters, agriculturists, and viticulturists, which corresponds to the nature of the country. Their home on the great roads of commerce also gave them tribute from that source, and they may have been carriers. Of their religion little is known; II Chron. xxv. 14 makes them polytheists (cf. I Kings xi. 5–6). Divine names form elements in the names usually borne by Edomites, and it has been shown to be plausible that the name Edom belonged to a deity who became the eponymous ancestor of the people (cf. the names Gad and Asher [qq.v.]). The name Obededom, "servant of Edom" (found also in an inscription from Carthage), is much in favor of this hypothesis, while an Egyptian papyrus knows of a goddess Atuma, possibly implying a Semitic male deity Atum. The element Baal in Baalhanan (Gen. xxxvi. 38–39) may be a mere appellative. Hadad (Hadar, Gen. xxxvi. 35–36, 39; I Kings xi. 14 sqq.) may have been an Aramean loan-god. In the cuneiform inscriptions a proper name is possibly to be read Malik-rammu, the first element of which may be compared with Moloch in its general meaning of king of his people. *Ye'ush*, an Edomite clan name (Gen. xxxvi. 5), may be the Edomitic form of Ya'uth, the name of an Arabic deity. Josephus (*Ant.* XV., vii. 9) knows of an Edomitic deity Koze, and he is corroborated by numerous inscriptions in cognate languages and by the element *Kaus* appearing in proper names (see below). Nothing is known of Edomitic civilization, though the trade-routes passing through the land must have had results in this direction. One of Job's friends was Eliphaz of Teman, presumably an Edomite, and it has been plausibly suggested that the Book of Job is Edomitic. Not a single inscrip-

The People.

tion of the language has survived, but the tongue probably differed only dialectically from Hebrew.

History till the Assyrian Period.

Apart from the early Biblical references (Gen. xxxvi. 35, which credits the Edomites with a victory over the Midianites), the region and its people enter history by the mention in Egyptian documents of the thirteenth century of Shasu (Bedouin) from Aduma (ut sup.) who were allowed to pasture their flocks near the Egyptian frontier, and a papyrus states that the Shasu of *Sa'aïra* (Seir) were defeated in battle (c. 1200). Gen. xxxii. 4, xxxvi. 8 asserts that Esau took up his abode on Mount Seir. The story of the Exodus makes Israel encompass the Edomitic territory, permission being refused to pass directly through the region. The next contact of the two peoples appears in the campaign of Saul against them (I Sam. xiv. 47), which appears to have had no permanent results, as David was in conflict with them probably in the valley south of the Dead Sea (II Sam. viii. 13–14; cf. I Kings xi. 15–16; I Chron. xviii. 11–13), and Joab is said to have extirpated the males in this campaign of half a year. At this time probably was laid the beginning of that intense enmity between the peoples which lasted till the time of Herod the Great. One of the royal house escaped either to Egypt (Heb. *Miẓraim*) or to the North Arabian *Muẓri* (see Assyria, VI, §2), where he married and his son Genubath was brought up, and then proved a thorn in the side of Solomon (I Kings xi. 14–22, 25b, where read *'Edhom* instead of *'Aram*, "Syrians"). The latter's command of the Gulf of Akaba, involving control of the roads leading thither, shows that the Edomitic territory was under Hebrew dominion (I Kings ix. 26–28). After the division of the kingdom Edom fell to the portion of Judah, and in the time of Jehoshaphat (c. 850) must still have been subject to Judah (II Kings iii.), since the king of Judah was in control of Ezion-geber (I Kings xxii. 48); it is also stated (ver. 47) that the ruler of Edom at the time was a "deputy" (cf. II Kings iii. 9. 10, 12, 26, where the ruler is called king). In the campaign of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat against Moab the Edomites furnished part of the allied forces, almost certainly as a tributary people. In the reign of Jehoshaphat's son Joram they revolted, with at least partial success (II Kings viii. 20–22; II Chron. xxi. 8–10). Amaziah inflicted a severe defeat (c. 790), capturing Selah (II Kings xiv. 7; II Chron. xxv. 11), and Amaziah's successor Uzziah was in possession of Elath, one of the ports on the Gulf of Akabah (II Kings xiv. 22; II Chron. xxvi. 2, 7). Later the Edomites seem to have been allies of the Syrians (II Kings xvi. 6), and were active against Judah (II Chron. xxviii. 17).

They figure in the cuneiform inscriptions about 734–732 as tributary to Assyria under their king Kausmalik. In 711 Edom was a member of the great western coalition against Sargon, but rendered tribute to the great conqueror. They were also in the confederation of 701 led by Hezekiah, but the Edomitic king Malik-rammu submitted and paid tribute. Kausgabri, king of Edom, was one of the princes subject to Esarhaddon (681–668) and to Asshurbanipal (668–626). Edomitie representatives were among those who consulted at Jerusalem, evidently with the idea of resisting the approach of Nebuchadrezzar (Jer. xxvii. 3). The Deuteronomic representation implies friendly relations about 625 (Deut. ii. 4–5, xxiii. 8). On the capture of Jerusalem Judean fugitives found refuge in Edom (Jer. xl. 11). Yet at that period the long hostility between the two peoples found vent in Edomitic rejoicing which raised new bitterness in the Hebrew mind (Lam. iv. 21–22; Ezek. xxxv. 3–15; Obad. 10–16). Edomites seized the territory of southern Judah, including the region about Hebron, to which the name of Idumea was given, bearing witness to the fact. A contributing cause for this northward movement was doubtless the pressure exerted upon Edom by the Nabatæan wave of migration from Arabia (see Arabia, III). There is reason to believe that the Edomites maintained their hold upon the district and even advanced to the neighborhood of Jerusalem, where they appear to have been just before the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, after which the strength of the Jews probably restricted them to the south. Judas the Maccabee fought them (I Macc. v. 3, 65) and finally drove them from Jewish territory. John Hyrcanus carried operations into their own country, conquered them, and compelled them (c. 109) to adopt Jewish rites and religion (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII. ix. 1, XV vii. 9; *War*, I. ii. 6, III. iii. 5), Idumea becoming fully recognized as Jewish territory. There is reason to believe that they were amalgamated with the Jews, lost their national identity, and added one more strain to the much-mixed blood of the Jews. The people of South Judah not only gave the dynasty of Herod (see Herod and His Family), but took part in the final revolt of the Jews against the Romans, and suffered with them in the catastrophe. Geo. W Gilmore.

Bibliography: F. Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter*, Leipsic, 1893; W. Libbey and F. E. Hoskins, *The Jordan Valley and Petra*, New York, 1905; Schrader, *KAT*, i. passim; F. Baethgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 10 sqq., Berlin, 1889; E. H. Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, 429 sqq., Cambridge, 1871; E. Hull, *Mount Seir, etc.*, pp. 85 sqq., London, 1885; J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, 3 vols., New York, 1894, 1896; E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, pp. 114 sqq., Halle, 1896; E. Robinson, *Researches*, ii. 117 sqq., 168 sqq., London, 1841–43; A. Musil, *Arabia Petræa*, ii., *Edom*, Vienna, 1908.

EDSALL, SAMUEL COOK: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Minnesota; b. at Dixon, Ill., Mar. 4, 1860. He studied at Racine College (B.A., 1882) and practised law until 1888, when he was graduated from the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago. In 1889 he founded St. Peter's, Chicago, of which he was rector until 1899, when he was consecrated missionary bishop of North Dakota. In 1901 he was translated to Minnesota as coadjutor to Bishop H. B. Whipple, and within the year, on the death of the aged bishop, assumed full control of the diocese.

EDUCATION: See Theological Education; also the articles on the various countries for the relations of Church and State and popular education. For education among the Hebrews, see Family and Marriage Relations, Hebrew, § 15.

EDWARD (EADWARD), SAINT, THE CONFESSOR: King of England 1042–66; b. at Islip

(5 m. n. of Oxford) c. 1003; d. at Westminster, London, Jan. 5, 1066. He was a son of Ethelred the Unready (king 979–1016) and nephew of Edward the Martyr (see DUNSTAN, SAINT). As a child he was sent to Normandy, his mother's country, and there he was brought up and lived, while the Danes, Canute and his sons, ruled England (1016–42). The desire of the English to restore the kings of their own race made Edward the general choice to succeed Hardicanute in 1042, and he was crowned at Winchester on Easter day, Apr. 3, 1043. As king the best that can be said for him is that he meant well; he was indolent and willingly left royal duties to others. The great earls really ruled England and their jealousies and intrigues were productive of disorder. Edward preferred his Norman friends to Englishmen and appointed his favorites in Church and State. The Normans, however, were superior to the English in arts and learning, and one result was a closer connection between the English Church and continental Christendom. English representatives appeared at papal synods and visited Rome (1050). Simony was scandalously prevalent. Edward gave much to monasteries. Between 1051 and 1061 he rebuilt the monastery of Thorney (Westminster), west of London and near his palace, and then he erected a new church, which was the first church in England of the Norman Romanesque style, and became the king's burial-place nine days after its consecration. Miracles were soon believed to be wrought at the tomb; and a mass of legend gathered about Edward's name, attributing to him visions and gifts of healing even before he became king. He was canonized by Alexander III. in 1161.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources: The *Vita* by Alred or Elred (d. 1166) with other material and prefatory comment is in *ASB*, Jan., i. 290–304, and part of this is in *MPL*, cxcv. 737–790; the *Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. H. R. Luard for the *Rolls Series*, no. 3, London, 1858, contains several works of primary importance; other material may be found in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I. and II.*, ed. W. Stubbs for the *Rolls Series*, no. 76, 2 vols., ib. 1882–83; and Matthew of Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H. R. Luard for *Rolls Series*, no. 57, vol. i., ib. 1872. The best modern book is E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest*, vol. ii., Oxford, 1879. Further material is in *Lyfe of Saynt Edwarde*, London, 1533; J. Porter, *Life of St. Edward, King and Confessor*, ib. 1710; J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England, 750–1071*, 2 vols., ib. 1889; F. Liebermann, *Ueber die leges Edwardi Confessoris*, Halle, 1896; J. H. Ramsay, *The Foundations of England*, . . *B.C. 55–A.D. 1154*, 2 vols., London, 1898; W. Hunt, *The English Church* . (*597–1066*), ib. 1899; *DNB*, xvii. 7–14; and, in general, the works on the history of the period.

EDWARDS, ALFRED GEORGE: Church of England bishop of St. Asaph; b. at Llanymowddwy (38 m. w. of Shrewsbury), Wales, Nov. 2, 1848. He studied at Jesus College, Oxford (B.A., 1874), and was ordained priest in 1875. He was curate of Llandingat, warden and headmaster of the college of Llandovery 1875–85, and vicar and rural dean of Carmarthen, as well as chaplain and private secretary to the bishop of St. Davids, 1885–89. In 1889 he was consecrated bishop of St. Asaph. He was select preacher to the University of Cambridge in 1891 and to the University of Oxford in 1895–96.

EDWARDS, BELA BATES: American theologian; b. at Southampton, Mass., July 4, 1802; d. at Athens, Ga., Apr. 20, 1852. He was graduated at Amherst in 1824 and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1830. From 1828 to 1833 he was assistant secretary of the American Education Society. In 1837 he was ordained and appointed professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary, succeeding Moses Stuart as professor of Biblical literature eleven years later. In 1846, in consequence of enfeebled health, he made an extended tour of Europe, visiting England, France, Germany, and Italy; and five years later he was again compelled to absent himself from Andover, and spend the winter in the South. Edwards originated and planned many philanthropic institutions, among others, that which has resulted in the Congregational Library at Boston. He was likewise active in editorial work, and in 1833 established *The American Quarterly Observer*, took the sole care of it for three years, and then merged it with *The American Biblical Repository*, which he edited from 1835 to 1838. In 1844, together with E. A. Park, he established the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and remained its editor-in-chief until 1852. Mainly through his influence *The Biblical Repository*, then published in New York, was merged with the *Bibliotheca Sacra* in 1851. To all these periodicals he contributed numerous articles and reviews. In addition to several educational books, he wrote *The Missionary Gazetteer* (Boston, 1832), and *The Biography of Self-Taught Men* (1832), besides editing the *Memoir of Henry Martyn* (1831). A selection of his sermons and addresses was published with a memoir of the author by E. A. Park (2 vols., Boston, 1853).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Memoir* by Park, ut sup., consult: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii. 735–743, New York, 1859; L. Woods, *History of Andover Theological Seminary*, Boston, 1884.

EDWARDS, JOHN: English Calvinist; b. at Hertford Feb. 26, 1637; d. at Cambridge Apr. 16, 1716. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1657, M.A., 1661, D.D., 1699). In 1664 he took charge of Trinity Church, Cambridge, but a few years later had to give up his work on account of his Calvinistic views. After having had several charges elsewhere he retired from the ministry in 1687, to devote himself to authorship, and returned to Cambridge in 1697, apparently for the use of the library. Though overestimated by his contemporaries, some of them calling him the St. Paul, or the St. Augustine, or the Calvin of his age, still he deserves high rank as a Calvinist theologian. Of the forty or more works that he published may be mentioned *The Socinian Creed* (London, 1697); *The Preacher* (3 vols., 1705–07); *Theologia reformata* (2 vols., 1713).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Biographia Britannica; DNB*, xvii. 121–123 (contains full list of Edwards' works).

EDWARDS, JONATHAN (THE ELDER): The founder of the New England theology as a distinct type of doctrine, considered by many the greatest theologian America has produced; b. at Windsor Farms (now East Windsor), Conn., Oct. 5, 1703; d. at Princeton, N. J., Mar. 22, 1758. His father, Rev. Timothy Edwards, was born at Hartford, in May, 1669, was graduated with honor at Harvard in 1691, and

Ancestry.

was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Windsor Farms, in 1694. He remained pastor of this church more than sixty-three years, and died Jan. 27, 1758. The mother of Jonathan Edwards was Esther Stoddard, daughter of Solomon Stoddard, who from 1672 to 1729 was pastor of the Congregational Church in Northampton, Mass. She was a woman of queenly presence and admirable character, was born in 1672, married in 1694, became the mother of eleven children, and died in 1770.

In his early years Jonathan Edwards was instructed chiefly at home. He began the study of Latin at the age of six, and before he was thirteen had acquired a good knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In his childhood he was taught to think with his pen in hand, and thus learned to think definitely, and to express his thoughts clearly. When he was about nine he wrote an interesting letter on materialism, and when he was about twelve he wrote some remarkable papers on questions in natural philosophy. One month before he was thirteen he entered Yale College, and was graduated, with the highest honors of his class, in 1720. At the age of fourteen, one of his college studies was *Locke on the Human Understanding*. Not long before his death, he remarked to certain friends that he was beyond expression entertained and pleased with this book when he read it in his youth at college; that he "was as much engaged, and had more satisfaction and pleasure in studying it, than the most greedy miser in gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some new-discovered treasure."

Early Studies. College.

As a child, his sensibilities were often aroused by the truths of religion. He united with the Church, probably at East Windsor, about the time of his graduation at college. After graduation he pursued his theological studies for nearly two years in New Haven. He was "approbated" as a preacher in June or July 1722, several months before he was nineteen. From Aug., 1722, until Apr., 1723, he preached to a small Presbyterian church in New York City. From 1724 to 1726 he was tutor at Yale. On Feb. 15, 1727, when in his twenty-fourth year, he was ordained as colleague with his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, and pastor of the Congregational Church at Northampton, Mass. On July 27 of that year he married Sarah Pierpont, daughter of Rev. James Pierpont of New Haven. At the time of her marriage, she was in the eighteenth year of her age, was distinguished by her graceful and expressive features, her vigorous mind, fine culture, and fervent piety. During her married life she relieved her husband of many burdens which are commonly laid upon a parish minister, and thus enabled him to pursue his studies with comparatively few interruptions. As a youthful preacher Edwards was eminent for his weighty thought and fervid utterance. His voice was not commanding, his gestures were few, but many of his sermons were overwhelming. He wrote some of them in full. Often he spoke extempore, oftener from brief but suggestive notes. The traditions relating to their power and influence appear well-nigh fabulous.

Theological Studies. Early Pastorate.

In 1734–35 there occurred in his parish a "great awakening" of religious feeling; in 1740–41 occurred another, which extended through a large part of New England (see REVIVALS OF RELIGION). At this time he became associated with George Whitefield (q.v.). During these exciting scenes, Edwards manifested the rare comprehensiveness of his mind. He did not favor the extravagances attending the new measures of the revivalists. He did more, perhaps, than any other American clergyman to promote the doctrinal purity, at the same time quickening the zeal, of the churches. In process of time he became convinced that his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, was wrong in permitting unconverted persons to partake of the Lord's Supper. A prolonged controversy with the Northampton church followed, and Edwards was ejected in 1750 from the pastorate which he had adorned for more than twenty-three years.

The Great Awakening. Ejected at Northampton.

In Aug., 1751, he was installed pastor of the small Congregational church in Stockbridge, Mass., and missionary of the Housatonic Indians at that place whom he served with fidelity. On Sept. 26, 1757, he was elected president of the college at Princeton, N. J. He was reluctant to accept the office, but finally yielded to the advice of others, and was dismissed from his Stockbridge pastorate Jan. 4, 1758. He spent a part of January and all of February at Princeton, performing some duties at the college, but was not inaugurated until Feb. 16, 1758. One week after his inauguration he was inoculated for the smallpox. After the ordinary effects of the inoculation had nearly subsided, a secondary fever supervened, and he died five weeks after his inauguration.

At Stockbridge. President of Princeton.

The more important works of President Edwards are the following: *A Divine and Supernatural Light Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God* (Boston, 1734), a sermon noted for its spiritual philosophy; the hearers of it at Northampton requested it for the press; *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of many Hundred Souls in Northampton, etc.* (Boston and London, 1737); *Five Discourses on Justification by Faith* (Boston, 1738); *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God* (Boston, 1741), one of his most terrific sermons; frequently republished; severely criticized by some who fail to regard the character and condition of the persons to whom it was preached; *Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God* (1741); *Some Thoughts concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New-England* (1742); *A Treatise concerning Religious Affections* (1746), one of his most spiritual and analytical works; *An Humble Attempt to promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer* (1747); *An Account of the Life of the Late Reverend Mr. David Brainerd . chiefly taken from his own Diary* (1749); *An Humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God, concerning the Qualifications requisite to a Complete Standing and full Communion in the Visible Christian Church* (1749). His more im-

Works.

portant works were published after he had left his first pastorate, some of them not until after his death, viz.: *A Careful and Strict Enquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notions of that Freedom of Will which is Supposed to be Essential to Moral Agency* (1754); *The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin Defended* (1758); *History of Redemption* (1772); *Dissertation concerning the End for which God created the World*, and *Dissertation concerning the Nature of True Virtue* (1788).

The published works of President Edwards were printed in eight volumes, at Worcester, Mass., 1808–09 (reprinted, New York). A larger edition of his writings, in ten volumes, including a new memoir and much new material, was published at New York, in 1829, by Rev. Dr. Sereno Edwards Dwight. (EDWARDS A. PARK†) F H. FOSTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The life has been written by S. Hopkins, Boston, 1765; J. Hawksley, London, 1815; S. E. Dwight, 1829 ut sup.; J. Iverach, in *The Evangelical Succession*, Edinburgh, 1882; A. V. G. Allen, Boston, 1889; H. N. Gardiner, ib. 1901; and W Walker, in *Ten New England Leaders*, pp. 217 sqq., New York, 1901. Consult further: J. Sparks, *The Library of American Biography*, vol. viii., 10 vols., New York, 1848–51; W B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 329–336, ib. 1859; H. M. Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years as seen in its Literature*, ib. 1880; G. P. Fisher, *Discussions in History and Theology*, ib. 1880; J. A. Stoughton, *Winsor Farmes*, Hartford, 1883; W Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 283–285, New York, 1893; idem, in *American Church History Series*, vol. iii. passim, ib. 1894; A. E. Dunning, *Congregationalists in America*, passim, ib. 1894; E. C. Smyth, in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, 1895, pp. 212–236; L. W. Bacon, *The Congregationalists*, passim, New York, 1904; *Jonathan Edwards Bicentenary, Memorial Volume of the Proceedings of the Andover Celebration, Oct. 1903*, Andover, 1904; I. W. Riley, *American Philosophy; the early Schools*, pp. 126–191, New York, 1907; F. H. Foster, *New England Theology*, Chicago, 1907.

EDWARDS, JONATHAN (THE YOUNGER): Second son and ninth child of Jonathan Edwards the Elder; b. at Northampton, Mass., May 26, 1745; d. at Schenectady, N. Y., Aug. 1, 1801. As he received the degree of D.D. from Princeton College, he is often called "Dr." Edwards, while his father (who was not a doctor of divinity) is distinguished as "President" Edwards. He entered the grammar-school at Princeton in Feb., 1760, and was graduated at Princeton College in 1765. He became a member of the Church in 1763, studied theology with Dr. Joseph Bellamy (q.v.) 1765–1766, and was "approbated" as a preacher in Oct., 1766, by the Litchfield County Association in Connecticut. He was indefatigably diligent while at college, served as tutor, 1767–69, and received an appointment (which he declined) to a professorship of languages and logic in the college. On Jan. 5, 1769, he was ordained as pastor of the Society of White Haven, in the town of New Haven, Conn. He remained in this office more than twenty-six years. Several members of his church were advocates of the Half-way Covenant (q.v.), which he opposed. His pastorate was also disturbed by the spiritual reaction which had followed the "Great Awakening" (see REVIVALS OF RELIGION) in 1740–42, and by the demoralizing influences of the Revolutionary War. The result was his dismission from his pastorate on the 19th of May, 1795.

Studies and First Pastorate.

In Jan., 1796, he was installed pastor of the church in Colebrook, Conn. In May, 1799, he was elected president of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. As he had declined a professorship at Princeton, so he was prompted to decline the presidency of Union College. He applied to an ecclesiastical council for advice: the advice was in favor of his removal. He was therefore dismissed in June, and entered on the duties of his presidency in July, 1799. He discharged his duties with his accustomed fidelity. His reputation as a philosopher gave him an uncommon influence over his pupils, and his skill as a teacher heightened his reputation as a philosopher. He remained in this office, however, but a short time. About the middle of July, 1801, he was attacked by an intermittent fever, and died Aug. 1.

Pastor at Colebrook and President of Union College.

As a theological teacher Dr. Edwards was eminently successful. He prepared certain of his father's writings for the press, and, while at Colebrook, published *A Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity, in Reply to the Rev. Dr. Samuel West* (Worcester, 1797). Besides a large number of articles in *The New York Thcological Magazine*, over the signatures "I" and "O," he published many sermons, among them one on *The Injustice and Impolicy of the Slave-trade* (New Haven, 1791; Dr. Edwards, like his friend Samuel Hopkins, was an early opponent of the slave system). The most celebrated of his discourses are the three *On the Necessity of the Atonement, and its Consistency with Free Grace in Forgiveness*, "preached before his Excellency the Governor, and a large number of both Houses of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, during their sessions at New Haven, in Oct., 1785, and published by request the same year." They have been frequently republished and form the basis of that theory of the atonement sometimes called the "Edwardean theory," commonly adopted by the "New England school of divines." Closely connected with this was a volume entitled *The Salvation of all Men strictly Examined, and the Endless Punishment of those who Die Impenitent, Argued and Defended against the Reasonings of Dr. Chauncey in his Book Entitled "The Salvation of all Men"* (1790). In 1788 he published a paper entitled *Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew Indians, in which the Extent of that Language in North America is Shown, its Genius Grammatically Traced, and Some of its Peculiarities, and Some Instances of Analogy between that and the Hebrew, are Pointed out.* This was "communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, and published at the request of the Society."

Works.

Nearly all of Dr. Edwards' published writings were collected and reprinted, with a *Memoir*, by Tryon Edwards, a descendant (Boston, 1842).

(EDWARDS A. PARK†.) F. H. FOSTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the *Memoir* by Tryon Edwards, ut sup., consult: *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine*, July, 1809; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i.

653–660, New York, 1859; J. A. Stoughton, *Winsor Farmes*, Hartford, 1883; W. Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 529–530, New York, 1893; idem, in *American Church History Series*, iii.293–299, ib. 1894; L. W. Bacon, *The Congregationalists*, passim, ib. 1904; F. H. Foster, *New England Theology*, Chicago, 1907.

EDWARDS, JUSTIN: American Congregationalist; b. in Westhampton, Mass., Apr. 25, 1787; d. at Bath Alum Springs, Va., July 24, 1853. He was graduated at Williams College in 1810 and studied one year at Andover Theological Seminary. He was ordained Dec. 2, 1812 and preached in Andover 1812–27. In 1821 he became the corresponding secretary of the New England Tract Society. He was one of the founders of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance in 1825, and as its secretary from 1829 to 1836 he traveled and lectured extensively in the interest of temperance reform. From 1836 to 1842 he was president of Andover Theological Seminary. In the latter year he became secretary of the American and Foreign Sabbath Union, and until 1849 he worked for the observance of the Sabbath as he had formerly done for the cause of temperance. He published numerous sermons and tracts, including a *Sabbath Manual* (New York, 1845), and a *Temperance Manual* (1847). The last years of his life were spent at Andover in the preparation of a compendious Bible commentary, which was left unfinished.

Bibliography: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii. 572–585, New York, 1859.

EDWIN (EADWINE): King of Northumbria; one of the greatest of the kings of Anglo-Saxon England and an earnest champion of Christianity; b. 585; slain in battle at Heathfield (probably Hatfield Chase, 7 m. n.e. of Doncaster, Yorkshire) Oct. 12, 633. He was born a heathen, son of Ella, king of Deira, who died when Edwin was three years old, whereupon the Bernician king, Ethelric, seized his kingdom. Edwin, during his boyhood and early manhood, was a wanderer, often in danger from the unrelenting pursuit of Ethelric and his son, Ethelfrid. In 616 or 617 he was at the court of Redwald, king of East Anglia, and may have met there with the Roman missionary Paulinus (q.v.). Redwald refused to deliver him up at the bidding of the Northumbrian king, attacked the latter, and defeated and slew him. Edwin now regained his kingdom. He established his capital at York and extended his dominions northward to the city which bears his name (Edinburgh), westward to the islands of Anglesea and Man, and southward over all England with the exception of Kent, with which he was in alliance. In 625 he married Ethelburga, princess of Kent, a Christian, and thus Paulinus gained admission to his court. For the story of Edwin's conversion see Paulinus of York. The king's greatness of mind is evident in his toleration of his wife's religion, in his reluctance to accept it himself without due deliberation and conviction, and in his conduct when once the decision was made. His first step was to announce his resolve to his witan and to ask if they would be baptized with him. The head priest is said to have been the first to give an affirmative answer, saying his service of the old gods had profited him nothing. After a noble had spoken in favor of a trial of the new religion, the others gave their assent and the priest led the way in desecrating the heathen temples and altars. Edwin gave Paulinus full permission to preach and baptize, and began a stone church at York. He persuaded Eorpwald of East Anglia to become a Christian. He ruled so well, says Bede, that a woman with her newborn infant could cross his realm from sea to sea without harm. He had cups placed beside the springs along the highways for the use of travelers, and such was the love or the fear of him that no one carried them away. It was an evil day for England when he was slain by Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, with the help of the Britons of Wales, who, though Christians, could not forget the old animosity against the Saxons.

Bibliography: Sources to be consulted are: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 5, 9–17, 20; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in *Monumenta historica Britannica*, ed. H. Petrie, J. Sharpe, and T. D. Hardy, London, 1848; Nennius, *Eulogium Britanniæ*, in *Monumenta historica Britannica*, ut sup.; Alcuin, *Carmen de pontificibus*, ed. J. Raine, in *Historians of York*, i. 349–398, cf. pp. lxi.–lxv., London, 1879; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 123, iii. 83–86. Consult: J. R. Green, *Making of England*, London, 1882; *DNB*, xvi. 132–134.

EDZARD, EZRA. See Jews, Missions to the.

EELLS, MYRON: Congregationalist; b. at Walker's Prairie, Wash., Oct. 7, 1843; d. near Union City, Wash., Jan. 4, 1907 He was graduated at Pacific University, Forest Grove, Ore., in 1866, and Hartford Theological Seminary in 1871. He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Boisé City, Ida., 1872–74, and after 1874 was a missionary of the American Missionary Association among the Indians at Skokomish, Wash. He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Skokomish, after 1876, and supplied several churches of his denomination in Washington. He was president of the Idaho Bible Society 1872–74, clerk of the Congregational Association of Oregon and Washington 1874–85, and superintendent of the Washington ethnological exhibit at the World's Fair, Chicago, in 1893. In theology he was a Congregationalist of the earlier school. He furnished collections of words, phrases, and sentences to the Smithsonian Institution in Chemakum (1878), Clallam (1878), Twana (1878), Skwaksin (1878), Lower Chehali (1882), Upper Chehali (1885), and Chinook Jargon (1888), and wrote *Twana Indians of Washington Territory*, in *United States Geographical and Geological Survey* (Washington, 1877); *Hymns in Chinook Jargon Language* (Portland, Ore., 1878); *History of the Congregational Association of Oregon and Washington* (1881); *History of Indian Missions on the Pacific Coast* (Philadelphia, 1882); *Ten Years at Skokomish* (Boston, 1886); *Twana, Clallam, and Chemakum Indians of the State of Washington* (Washington, 1887); *Father Eells* (Boston, 1894); and *Reply to Prof. E. G. Bourne on the Whitman Question* (Walla Walla, Wash., 1902).

EGBERT, SAINT: Early English saint; b. of noble lineage in Northumbria 639; d. at Iona Easter day, Apr. 24, 729. In his youth he went to Ireland for study, accompanied by Ceadda (q.v.) and others. Seized by the plague in 664, he vowed that, if he recovered, he would never return to

Britain, would recite the Psalter daily, and would fast a day and a night every week. This vow he kept faithfully and added to it new austerities. He became a priest, renowned for humility, kindness, and learning. He desired to preach the Gospel to the tribes on the continent from whom the Angles and Saxons of Britain had sprung, gathered a company, and set sail (686 or 687); but, warned by visions, as he supposed, and driven back by a storm, he returned to Ireland. His interest continued, however, and about 690 he sent an Englishman, Witbert, on an unsuccessful mission to the Frisians, and in 692 he despatched Willibrord (q.v.) and his company. He did much to persuade the Irish to conform to Rome in regard to Easter and the tonsure, and in 716 went to Iona and worked successfully and with much tact for the same end there and on the mainland of Scotland.

Bibliography: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 4, 27, iv. 3, v. 9, 10, 22, 23; *ASB*, April, iii. 313–315, cf. 997; Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 513; W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 278–282, Edinburgh, 1880; *DCB*, ii. 49 sqq.; *DNB*, xvii. 146 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, i. 416–417.

EGBERT OF YORK: First archbishop of York; d. at York Nov. 19, 766. He was of royal family and a brother of Edbert, king of Northumbria 737–758. His childhood and youth were spent in the monastery of Hexham; then he went to Rome, where he learned the Roman usages and was ordained deacon. He was an intimate friend of Bede, who wrote him a letter (in Plummer's *Bede*, i. 405–423) when he was made bishop of York. He received the pallium from Pope Gregory III. in 735 and thus became independent of Canterbury. For his great learning he was called *armarium omnium liberalium artium*. His greatest achievement, perhaps, was the founding of a school attached to his cathedral church and the training of competent teachers for it; it became for the north of England what Canterbury was for the south and among its teachers were Egbert's successor Albert (Ethelbert), and the great pupil of the latter, Alcuin. He esteemed classical learning, promoted grammatical study, church music, and the recording of contemporary history, and collected a library highly praised by Alcuin (q.v.). The latter and Egbert's anonymous biographer speak of his admirable qualities in the warmest terms. Boniface applied to the influential and learned archbishop in two extant letters (in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 358–360, 388–390), begging him to use his influence with Ethelbald, the powerful king of Mercia, asking for certain works of Bede's, and seeking advice in a question of conscience. Egbert's replies are, unfortunately, not preserved. He was buried in his church in York. Several works of Egbert's are preserved, but not in original form; they are (1) a dialogue on the government of the Church and church discipline (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 403–413); (2) a penitential (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 413–433); (3) a pontifical (ed. W. Greenwall, Surtees Society publications, xxvii., Durham, 1853); (4) a work *De jure sacerdotali*; (5) the *De remediis peccatorum* is merely a section of the larger collection.

H. Hahn.

Bibliography. Sources: *Vita Alcuini* in Jaffé, *BRG*, vi.; Alcuin, *De pontificibus et sanctis ecclesiæ Eboracensis*, in *MGH, Poetæ*, i (1881), 169–206, transl. in J. Raine, *Historians of the Church of York*, i. 348–398, cf. preface, lxi.–lxv., London, 1879; Bede, *Epistola ad Egbertum* in *MPL*, xciv., and in *Opera*, ed. by J. Smith, pp. 207–226, London, 1841; Simeon of Durham, *Hist. Dunelmensis ecclesiæ*, ed. by T. Arnold, London, 1882, transl. in J. Stevenson, *Church Historians of England*, v., London, 1855; William of Malmesbury, *De rebus gestis regum Anglorum* in *MGH, Script.*, x (1852), 449–484, transl. in J. Stevenson, as above, vol. iv., London, 1855; Boniface, *Epistola* in *MGH, Epistolarum*, iii (1891), 207 sqq. Consult also *Fasti Eboracenses*, ed. by W. H. Dixon, i. 94–100, London, 1863; *DCB*, ii (1880), 50–52; H. Hahn, *Bonifaz und Lul*, pp. 189 sqq., Leipsic, 1883; *DNB*, xvii (1889), 147–148.

EGEDE, eg'e-de, HANS.

Early Life (§ 1).
Settlements in Greenland (§ 2).
Interest in Mission to Greenland (§ 3).
Success as a Missionary (§ 4).
Royal Support Withdrawn and Restored (§ 5).
Closing Years (§ 6).

Norwegian apostle of Greenland; b. at Trondenäs, a village on the island of Senjen (n.w. coast of Norway), Jan. 31, 1686; d. at Stubbekjöbing (58 m. s.w. of Copenhagen) in the island of Falster, Denmark, Nov. 5, 1758. After completing his studies at the University of Copenhagen, he took charge, about the age of twenty-one, of the Lutheran parish of Vaagen, one of the Lofoden Islands, and soon afterward married Gertrude Rask. From his brother-in-law, a whaler of Bergen, he learned that the southwestern part of Greenland was inhabited by heathen, and his interest in them was still further increased by reading old Norse chronicles.

1. Early Life.

During the tenth century pagan Northmen had migrated from Iceland to Greenland, and had driven back the aborigines, who were called Skrällingen; but about the year 1000 Christianity seems to have taken root among the colonists. About 1348, however, the "black death," raging throughout Europe, severed communication with the kingdom, and the aborigines seized the opportunity to destroy one settlement after another. For some sixty years the Church survived, but the year 1410 marks the cessation of all authentic reports concerning the colony and Church. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the kings of Denmark and Norway sent a series of expeditions to regain the province, which failed, but the enthusiasm awakened in Egede's heart and his hope in a higher goal were destined to win a victory.

2. Settlements in Greenland.

Despite the opposition of high and low, as well as of his nearest kin, he became more and more convinced that he was called to go to these poorest of his brethren, but the bishops of Bergen and Trondhjem, before whom he laid his "proposal for the conversion and enlightenment of the Greenlanders," recoiled from the difficulties, and even the missionary college founded at Copenhagen in 1714 gave him faint sympathy. In 1717 he resigned his pastorate, and went, in the autumn of the following year, to Bergen with his wife and four children. There he not only tried to interest friends in his plan of a Greenland mission

3. Interest in Mission to Greenland.

in connection with commercial enterprises, but also acquired some mechanical and technical knowledge. In the spring of 1719, when peace was made on the conclusion of the northern war, Egede went to Copenhagen to see King Frederick in person. The latter acceded to his plan, but his assistance was ineffectual, and Egede perceived that he himself must assume the entire responsibility. After repeated disappointments he found a few friends in Bergen and elsewhere, who formed with him a "Greenland Society" and contributed a fund which enabled them to buy the ship "Hope." Shortly afterward (1721) the missionary college notified him that the king sanctioned the intended expedition and appointed Egede missionary and leader with a salary of 300 rix-dollars.

On May 3, 1721, the little band of forty-six, including Egede's family, left Bergen; on June 12 they came in sight of Statenhuk, the southern point of Greenland; and on July 3, after much peril, they reached a safe haven and promising site for their colony on the western coast. The natives, who thronged around them, but soon timidly disappeared, turned out to be Eskimos, descendants of those who had destroyed the earlier Icelandic colonists. They were very ignorant, and had few religious ideas, while their unorganic language, with no relation to any European tongue, presented a serious obstacle to missionary endeavor. With the help of his children, however, who quickly made friends with the aborigines, Egede gradually mastered their language, into which he soon translated the catechism of Luther. He was indefatigable in visiting his charges, and amid privation and danger he became a Greenlander to the Greenlanders, winning the hearts of even the unfriendly Angekoks (sorcerers). In his first colony of Godthaab ("Good Hope") he paid special attention to the children; and although he was, perhaps, too scrupulous with regard to adults and laid too strict conditions upon them, he gladly baptized boys and girls, provided their parents also welcomed the preaching of the Gospel. His chief obstacle was his own countrymen, who murmured at their hard lot and caused grave scandal to the natives on account of their evil lives, particularly after the government had transported a number of outcasts after his arrival. He was cheered, on the other hand, by the constantly increasing eagerness of the natives to accept Christianity. In 1723 he received the aid of his first colleague, Albert Topp, who had been appointed to establish a second colony, and they were soon joined by two others, as well as by his son Paul and, a little later by his younger son Niels, while a few years afterward a native assistant was added.

4. Success as a Missionary.

In 1727 the Bergen-Greenland company was dissolved, since it was a commercial failure, and after the death of Frederick IV. a second blow befell Egede, when, in 1731, the king commanded that the colony should be entirely abandoned as financially unprofitable. If, however, Egede and others preferred to remain, a year's provisions should be left for them. Egede, who had at last secured a firm footing, willingly yielded to the importunity of the Greenlanders, who would not let him go, and he remained with the few courageous souls who braved privation and danger. At this crisis Count Zinzendorf, who was then at Copenhagen, prevailed upon Christian VI. to renew his support of Egede and to give him a public testimony of acknowledgment in addition to granting him a generous subvention and indorsing his plans for continuing the mission (April 4, 1733). An epidemic of smallpox ravaged the country until June, 1734. The victims numbered 3,000, while in the colony of Godthaab, which contained more than 200 families, all the Greenlanders died with the exception of a boy and a girl. Egede stood as in a desert. His faithful wife succumbed to her almost superhuman efforts and he himself, broken in body and soul determined to entrust the stricken land to the more robust strength of his son Paul and to promote the work of his life henceforth from a more quiet spot.

5. Royal Support Withdrawn and Restored.

In 1736 he returned to Copenhagen; became director of a training-school for missionaries to Greenland, and in 1740 superintendent of the mission work there. In 1747 he retired to Stubbekjöbing and henceforth had no official connection with mission work in Greenland, but his interest continued and his son Paul was a noted Greenland scholar and the translator of the New Testament into its language.

J. BELSHEIM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief sources are Egede's *Omständelig Relation*, Copenhagen, 1738, and his Diary (in Danish), ed. E. Sundt, Christiania, 1860; A. G. Rudelbach, *Christliche Biographien*, pp. 371–434, Leipsic, 1850; J. Olaf, in *Sonntags Bibliothek*, vi. 2, Bielefeld, 1853; E. M. Bliss, *Encyclopædia of Missions*, i. 332–333, New York, 1891 (2d ed. not so full).

EGLI, EMIL: Swiss theologian; b. at Flaach (15 m. n.n.e. of Zurich) Jan. 9, 1848; d. in Zurich Dec. 31, 1908. He was educated at the University of Zurich, held charges in its canton, became tutor in its university in 1880 and later full professor of church history. He was the foremost Zwingli scholar of his time and made remarkable contributions to Zwingliana and to Zurich reformation history, e.g., *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation in den Jahren 1519–1533* (Zurich, 1879); *Analecta Reformatoria*, I. *Dokumente und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Zwinglis und seiner Zeit*, II. *Biographien:* Bibliander, Ceporin, Johannes Bullinger (2 vols., 1899–1901); his editorship of *Zwingliana*, the semi-annual publication since 1897 of the Zwingli Museum in Zurich; and chiefly since 1904, and in conjunction with Georg Finsler, of the probably final edition of Zwingli's *Werke* (Berlin, vol. i. completed 1905, vol. ii. 1908; vol. iii. was to begin the correspondence).

EGINHARD. See EINHARD.

EGLINUS (von Goetzen; Lat. *Iconius*), RAPHAEL: Swiss theologian, an advocate of Calvin's doctrines in Hesse; b. at Rüssickon (5 m. s. of Zurich) Dec. 28, 1559; d. at Marburg Aug. 20, 1622. He was the son of a clergyman, received instruction in Chur and Chiavenna, studied in Zurich, then under Beza in Geneva, and under Grynæus in Basel. His first position was as a

teacher at Sondrio in the Valtelline, whence, in 1586, he was compelled to emigrate on account of measures taken by the Roman Catholics against the Evangelicals. He stayed a short while in Winterthur, and in 1588 went to Zurich, where he filled various positions, at last that of professor of the New Testament and archdeacon at the minster. His inclination for theosophy and alchemy was disastrous, for the latter deranged his finances so that he had to flee from Zurich on account of debt in 1601; nevertheless he was helped by his friends, was enabled to return, and accepted a call of the Landgrave Maurice to Cassel. Himself a friend of alchemy, the landgrave made Eglinus a teacher in the court school there, and in 1606 appointed him the fourth professor of theology in Marburg, in 1614 creating him also court preacher. During this Hessian period Eglinus did not give up his alchemistic tastes, and was encouraged by the landgrave, with whom he carried on a lively correspondence about his experiments. These interests brought him also into connection with the Rosicrucians, for whom he published an apology in 1618. In spite of his occupation with these side-issues Eglinus had no little influence as a theologian, for the introduction of the (Reformed) *Verbesserungspunkte* (q.v.) by the landgrave occurred during his stay in Hesse, and he gave important aid, by his literary work, as well as through his teaching, in establishing the Reformed confession in that land.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. W. Strueder, *Grundlage zu einer hessischen Gelehrten- und Schriftsteller-Geschichte*, iii. 299–318, Göttingen, 1783 (contains a list of the works of Eglinus).

ÉGLISE CATHOLIQUE-FRANÇAISE. See CHÂTEL, FERDINAND FRANÇOIS.

EGYPT.

I. Ancient Egypt.
1. The Land.
The Names (§ 1).
Extent, Boundaries and Divisions (§ 2).
Climate and Products (§ 3).
2. The People.
Ethnology and Language (§ 1).
Customs (§ 2).
Manufactures (§ 3).
Officials (§ 4).
3. Chronology.
4. History.
Conspectus and Sources (§ 1).
Hyksos, Pharaohs and their Successors to the Exodus (§ 2).
Exodus to the Assyrian Period (§ 3).
Period of Assyrian Contact (§ 4).
Babylonian and Later Periods (§ 5).
5. Religion.
General Features (§ 1).
Polytheism Dominant (§ 2).
Religious Texts (§ 3).
6. Exploration and Excavation.
The First Period, 1798–1830 (§ 1).
Private and Tuscan-Prussian Work, 1832–50 (§ 2).
Mariette, 1851–81 (§ 3).
The Recent Period, since 1881 (§ 4).
General Results (§ 5).
II. Modern Egypt.
Statistics, General and Religious (§ 1).
The Orthodox Greek Church (§ 2).
Other Communions (§ 3).

I. Ancient Egypt.—1. The Land: The name is derived from the Greek *Aigyptos*, which is a possible, but not a probable, derivative from one of the native names of Memphis; the Semitic names, Hebrew, *Miẓraim*, Babylonian, *Miẓri*, Assyrian, *Muẓur*, all go back to a common root. The etymology of both sets of names is uncertain. The native name was *Kemet* (*km-t*), "black," in reference to the color of the arable soil when contrasted with the sand and rock which border it.

1. The Names.

Egypt has a superficial area scarcely equal to that of Belgium; shaped like a fan with a disproportionately long handle—the Nile valley, which averages only about ten miles in width. From the dawn of its history it was divided into two parts, indicated in the title of the kings, "lord of Upper and Lower Egypt," the point of division being somewhat south of Cairo. In ancient times each of these parts was divided into twenty-two *nomoi*, districts, recognized for administrative purposes, but their origin is to be found in tribal limits. The union of the two parts into one kingdom was ascribed to Menes, the first king, and it marked the actual beginning of Egyptian history. The arable ground was formed by the silt brought down by the Nile, and its fertility was due to the same agency. This is particularly true of the northerly portion, the Delta, though the removal of a few inches of the surface renders the ground sterile. Within historic times the land along the coast has been gradually sinking. Formerly the Nile discharged into the Mediterranean and the Red Sea by seven mouths, only two of which now remain, the others being represented by canals. On the west of Egypt is the Libyan desert, from which the sands blow over the arable land at certain seasons. On the east also it is desert in the southerly portion; at the northeast the (former) Bitter Lakes represent an old arm of the Red Sea to the north of which was a series of garrison towns intended to guard against the incursions of the Bedouin.

2. Extent, Boundaries and Divisions.

Upper Egypt is a land of almost perpetual sunshine; storms and rain occur near the coast. The preservation of the antiquities of the land is due to this circumstanee, as the dry sand is a great conserver of even the fragile papyrus. The fertility of the soil is due to irrigation by the Nile under natural conditions or when artificially impounded. Reference is made to this fertility (Gen. xiii. 10), and to artificial irrigation (Deut. xi. 10) in the Old Testament. The seasons are reckoned as three: beginning with the inundation (about July 20), spring, and harvest, the last beginning toward the end of March. The fauna of ancient Egypt was very varied, as is evident from the pictures on tomb walls and in the variety of animal forms utilized for the hieroglyphic writing. The camel and horse were imported late: the horse (I Kings x. 28) was introduced apparently by the Hyksos. It was used principally in war, with the chariot, and was depicted as a hieroglyphic sign after the New Kingdom only. The camel (Gen. xii. 16; Ex. ix. 3: J passages) is not mentioned till the Greek period. The ass has always been the burden-bearer. The flora was luxuriant, but not greatly varied, being mainly restricted to the staples,

3. Climate and Products.

making Egypt the "granary" of the ancient world. The storage of grain products is mentioned in Gen. xli. 35, and is familiar from the remains of the "store city" Pithom (Ex. i. 11) discovered by Naville, and from the representations upon tomb walls. The latter depict structures like a haycock with an aperture at the top through which the grain was thrown. The usual Oriental method of threshing was by the feet of cattle (Deut. xxv. 4), and winnowing was done with shovel and fan (Isa. xxx. 24). Various articles of vegetable food used in Egypt are mentioned in Num. xi. 5. The papyrus which furnished the writing material of antiquity also flourished, but wood was scarce. Objects as large as a sarcophagus had to be made by joining pieces with wooden dowels, a process in which the Egyptian acquired great skill. Minerals known to the Egyptians were gold and iron, from the region of Syene and the south, copper or bronze from Sinai and Cyprus, and silver in smaller quantities by foreign import. Silver was scarcer and more highly valued than gold. Building stone was abundant and varied—limestone in the north, granite in the south, and sandstone between.

2. The People: No theory of the origin of the people has found general acceptance, except that the ruling class came from Asia, but whether by way of Nubia, the Red Sea and Koptos, or Suez, is disputed. It has been contended that the language points to an original Semitic stock, that the mythology indicates a Babylonian parentage, and that the racial features point southward. It is worthy of note that the inscriptions do not point to or hint at any consciousness of foreign extraction or any aboriginal immigration. The language has many characteristics of the Semitic group, mainly in its grammatical features; the vocabulary shows variations which indicate an entirely diverse origin. If it was originally Semitic the relation was collateral rather than by way of descent. The earliest connected texts now extant are the so-called "pyramid-texts" beginning in the end of the fifth dynasty (say 2650 B.C.) and strangely enough these texts are written in a more strictly phonetic form than those of later times. Herein consists the difficulty and uncertainty of their interpretation. The artistic ability also of this period and the degree of development of religious belief and practise are well worthy of remark. The classic period of the language was in the twelfth dynasty, and later periods attempted to imitate the earlier model. The Coptic was the daughter of the Egyptian, and continued to be spoken till the seventeenth century A.D. The original system of writing was strictly hieroglyphic, variations being due to abbreviations for the sake of speed and of adaptation to the writing material employed, papyrus. The characters used for stone sculpture, the hieroglyphic, consisted of pictures of objects in nature and domestic life executed in greater or less detail and with a remarkable degree of accuracy; the "hieratic" was not a "priestly" script, but merely an abbreviated form, the characters being applied to the papyrus with a brush; and the "demotic" was a further and later abbreviation of the hieratic, not a "popular" chirography. The first two were used coincidently and some mistakes in hieroglyphic texts can be corrected and understood only upon the assumption that the stonecutter misread a character in his hieratic copy. It is evident also in some of the recensions of the "Book of the Dead" that the scribes of the New Kingdom were unable to understand some of the characters and words found in early copies of the work in the chirography of the Middle Kingdom, and that their perplexity was as great as that of modern scholars. The characters used possess varied powers, some being purely alphabetic, others syllabic, and others ideographic or determinative.

1. Ethnology and Language.

Polygamy was practised as in the East generally, and concubinage was also a recognized institution, both depending upon the ability of the man to support a harem. The marriage practises of Egypt are set forth in great detail in Lev. xviii. and what is now known bears out the accuracy of the account. In the royal house, concerning which special opportunities for knowledge exist, several of the Pharaohs married their own sisters, following a divine example supposed to have been set notably in the case of Osiris and Isis. Political alliances were cemented by intermarriage. The taking of Sarah (Gen. xii. 14, 15) for the royal harem was an example of a general custom, and the story of Potiphar's wife finds an almost exact parallel in the "Tale of Two Brothers" in the D'Orbiney papyrus now in the British Museum. The statement that the son of Hadad was brought up with the sons of Pharaoh (I Kings xi. 20) is identical with the cases of many Egyptian officials who claimed it as a mark of honor that they were educated among the children of the court. The case of Moses (Ex. ii. 10) was similar in part only. The practise of shaving the head, changing the raiment, washing the feet, bowing in obeisance (Gen. xli. 14, xliii. 24, 28) were all part of Egyptian practise. Unfortunately little is known of the court ceremonial of Egypt, but what is known bears out the Biblical record. In the Ancient Kingdom the practise of "kissing the ground" before the king was so much the practise, that a high priest of Memphis mentions it as a mark of special favor that the king did not insist upon the performance of this act of submission, but required him to kiss his foot. But the rigor of this ceremony was relaxed in the period of the New Kingdom. Slavery was imposed upon conquered peoples in accordance with universal Oriental practise. The abhorrence of the Egyptian for foreigners (Gen. xliii. 32, xlvi. 34) is to be explained upon the ground of the fundamental difference between the two, as emphasized in the Egyptian conception of their origin. The great gods had appeared in Egypt only; there the great sun-god Ra had warred and ruled, and his posterity still sat upon the throne with the title "son of the sun," ruling over those who alone were entitled to the name of men, while foreigners were never men but only negroes, Libyans, or "miserable" Asiatics, who had once rebelled against the great god Ra, and for their insubordination had been driven north, south, and west. The special "abomination" in which shepherds were held

2. Customs.

(Gen. xlvi. 34) was not on account of the fact that the land had been conquered by "shepherd kings," though this may have made the conquest the more galling. To the Egyptian the shepherd was an unshaved, dirty, undressed pariah. His home was in the swamp, and while a necessary appendage to a large farm, he received no honor at the hands of his master. This seems the more strange, since it was with the utmost pride that the number of cattle, sheep, oxen, and goats is recounted and portrayed on the walls of the tombs.

The wagons provided by Joseph (Gen. xlv. 19) appear to have been carts adapted to the transport of household goods and of persons incapable of the prolonged standing required by the ordinary chariot. Both chariots and carts seem to have been introduced along with the horse in the dark period assigned to the Hyksos rule.

3. Manufactures. Bricks were made of Nile mud, and were frequently stamped with the cartouche of the reigning Pharaoh. They were either baked or sun-dried. Naville reports that the bricks found at Pithom were of two sorts, mud mixed with straw and mud alone (Ex. i. 14, v. 7, 18). Unfortunately none of the bricks from Pithom bear a royal stamp. Linen and broidered work (Ezek. xxvii. 7) are mentioned specially, and beautiful specimens of this fabric are preserved in many museums. Baskets (Gen. xl. 16) for conveying small objects are depicted in funerary scenes of all ages, particularly in carrying grain and sand, and the same practise has persisted to the present time.

The title for the king (Gen. xii. 15) which is used in the Pentateuch, gives no clue to the identity of any particular individual mentioned. "Pharaoh" is derived from the native title, which is made up of the words *per-aa*, signifying "great house," and is similar to the Turkish "Sublime Porte." The claim of the divine origin of the ruling class is seen in the ordinary appendage to the coronation name, "son of Ra." Biblical references to

4. Officials. the officers of the government are few. The position to which Joseph was named has approximate parallels. In the Ancient Kingdom there was a man who boasted the title of "overseer of the whole land," while officials having similar charge in later times recognize the geographical divisions of the land in their titles. In the New Kingdom we find a man who appears as the mouthpiece of Pharaoh, and another whose office was that of "overseer of the granaries," of whom it is said that his province included not only Egypt but also Ethiopia and all the territory to the confines of Naharina (Mesopotamia). Potiphar (Gen. xxxvii. 36, xxxix. 1) is spoken of as captain of the guard (R. V., margin, "chief of the executioners"). The latter title is explained by the supposition that extreme punishment was executed by the chief officer of the body-guard. As this officer lived probably in the time of the Hyksos, and as very little is known about this period, little light can be thrown upon the subject. Later the body-guard was formed of mercenaries, and the position of chief was one of great importance. The mention of a chief baker and a chief butler (Gen. xl.) is exactly in line with the household service of the upper classes as well as that of the king. Each sort of service had a special corps which was charged with it, and each corps had its overseer. Similarly in the field each gang of workmen had an overseer or "taskmaster" (Ex. i. 11, iii. 7). Among the insignia of office mentioned as having been turned over to Joseph was the signet ring (Gen. xli. 42). As all legal and commercial documents were stamped with a seal, the significance of this emblem of office is apparent.

3. Chronology: Egypt, like other Oriental countries, used no era in dating the events of its history. All that have been handed down to us are partial lists of kings such as those of Abydos, Karnak, and Sakkarah, containing selections of seventy-six, sixty-one, and forty-seven royal names respectively, and even the sequence of these is doubtful. The only known complete native list, with the years of the reign of each king, was contained in the ever to be regretted Turin papyrus which was irreparably damaged during its journey to Europe. In its present fragmentary condition it is incapable of rendering much aid in fixing of Egyptian chronology. The historical work written in Greek by the native priest Manetho about 250 B.C. has been preserved only in excerpts of somewhat doubtful accuracy given by Josephus and Julius Africanus. Mistakes occur in the figures due both to copyists' mistakes and to apologetic emendation. Manetho's division of the entire period into thirty dynasties, however, furnishes a convenient method of indicating the relative location of events. Dates approximating exactness can not be assigned back of the New Kingdom, and precise chronology begins with the accession of Psammetichus in 663 B.C. It is claimed, however, that the date of Amenhotep I. of the twelfth dynasty, has been fixed astronomically at 2000 B.C., and that the reign of Thothmes III. extended from May 3, 1501, till Mar. 7, 1447. Many *a priori* theories and corresponding systems of chronology have been propounded, but the best results are only approximations so far as the earlier periods are concerned. One notable feature of recent investigation is seen in the tendency to reduce the length of the history as a whole. This is evident from the appended chronological table.

Dynasty.	Champollion.	Brugsch	Petrie.	Meyer.	Breasted.
I.–II.	5867	4400	4777	3180	3400 B.C.
III.	5318	3966	4212		2980 "
IV.	5121	3733	3998	2830	2900 "
V.	4673	3566	3721		2750 "
VI.	4425	3300	3503	2530	2625 "
VII.–VIII.	4222	3033	3322		2475 "
IX.–X.	4047		2821		2445 "
XI.	3762		2985		2160 "
XII.	3703	2466	2778	2130	2000 "
XIII.–XVII.	3417	2233	2098	1930	1788 "
XVIII.	1822	1700	1587		1580 "
XIX.	1473	1400	1375	1530	1350 "
XX.	1279	1200	1202		1200 "
XXI.	1101	1100	1102	1060	1090 "
XXII.	971	966	952	930	945 "
XXIII.	851	766	755		745 "
XXIV.	762	733	731		718 "
XXV.	718	700	721	728	712 "
XXVI.	674	666	664	663	663 "
Persians	524	527	525	525	525 "
Greeks	331				332 "
Romans					30 "

The figures of Brugsch are based on the average length of a human generation; Meyer's on the minimum reign-lengths shown by the records; astronomical calculations depend on eclipses as related to the Sothic periods of 1,460 years and the variable year of 365 days. The earlier systems suffered from insufficient data for the application of the method of "dead-reckoning," which is the only system really available.

4. History: The predynastic period is little known, but excavations made mainly since the beginning of the present century have begun to throw light upon the subject. The work of De Morgan and Petrie is of initial importance. The main divisions of the history, based upon the thirty dynasties of Manetho are: (1) the Ancient Kingdom, dynasties I.–VI., say 3400–2475 B.C.; (2) the Middle Kingdom, dynasties XI.–XII., 2160–1788 B.C.; (3) the New Kingdom, dynasties XVIII.–XX., 1580–1090 B.C.; (4) the period of decline and foreign intervention, dynasties XXI.–XXV., 1090–663 B.C.; (5) the period of restoration, dynasty XXVI., 663–525 B.C.; (6) the Persian and Greek domination, dynasty XXVII. onward, 525–30 B.C.; for details as to the history, reference must be made to the special works on that subject. The gaps in the above list represent dark periods about which little is known. Dynasties seven to ten were occupied with internal strife resulting in the removal of the seat of power from Memphis gradually southward to Thebes. Dynasties thirteen to seventeen covered also a period of unrest and of foreign domination by the Hyksos, "Sheiks of the Bedouin," who were probably of Semito-Hittite race. The sources of the history are numerous and consist of antiquities illustrating manners and beliefs; texts on stone, leather and papyrus, containing the facts forming the raw material of historical representation; records in the cuneiform character and in Hebrew tradition as well as the accounts preserved by Greek travelers and historians. Aside from the Turin papyrus and Manetho's work, there is no evidence of the compilation of a complete list of the kings which could be called even a comprehensive outline or framework of the history. The annals of some of the kings, and the records of the separate temples constitute the historical writings of the Egyptians, and these extended scarcely beyond lists of names and reign-lengths. The available material is widely scattered, and while remarkably full for some periods, is for the most part meager and unsatisfactory.

1. Conspectus and Sources.

It is probable that the immigration of the sons of Jacob must be assigned to the period of the Hyksos (before 1580 B.C.). There are pictures on tomb-walls which represent the approach of shepherds of peculiarly Semitic features, and a papyrus tells of permission granting grazing privileges to others of that race. There is also a Ptolemaic tradition of a seven-year dearth in the reign of Zoser (2890 B.C.). The journey of Abraham to Egypt and the resort thither against famine are quite in line with known fact. The theory which identifies the expulsion of the Hyksos with the Exodus of the Israelites (Josephus) is impossible chronologically without destroying the historicity of the latter event. Thothmes III. (1501–1447 B.C.) was the embodiment of the warlike spirit which the Egyptians had acquired from their conflict with the Hyksos. He pushed his conquests through Palestine, leaving a record of the places he had conquered on the walls of the temple of Amon at Karnak. In this list were included the names of Kadesh on the Orontes, Megiddo, Damascus, Hamath, Acco, Joppa, Gezer, etc. Later glimpses of the condition of the Palestinian dependencies of Egypt are derived from the cuneiform tablets found at Tell el-Amarna (see AMARNA TABLETS). These tablets were sent by the local vassals of the Pharaohs, and contain items of information, private and political, written in Babylonian, the language of the diplomacy of the period. The picture which they give is of the time just preceding the Exodus. They were composed for the information of Pharaohs who are generally supposed to have been largely under Semitic influence, one of whom made the only attempt in Egyptian history to introduce a monotheistic form of religion and worship. The attempt came to nothing permanent, and the power of Egypt in Palestine was overthrown soon afterward. Not till the time of Rameses II. (1292–1225 B.C.) was the reconquest attempted. He made his influence felt as far as the Lebanon, and his twenty-first year was marked by a treaty of peace with the Hittites. He is commonly regarded as the Pharaoh of the oppression, and the fact that he was the builder of Pithom confirms the Hebrew tradition. The absence of any personal designation in the title Pharaoh, precludes the possibility of absolute identification in most cases. The power of Egypt in Palestine did not long survive Rameses II., and it must have been during this period that the Hebrews took possession of the land.

2. Hyksos, Pharaohs and their Successors to the Exodus.

The Exodus is usually assigned to the reign of Merneptah (1225–1215 B.C.) the successor of Rameses II. The earliest extant mention of the name of Israel is in a victory-stele (discovered in 1896) which this king erected. The name is enumerated in connection with other places in Palestine and Syria as scenes of the Pharaoh's conquests. On its face it is evidence that a tribe bearing this designation had been defeated in Palestine; but as it stands alone, an uncorroborated witness to the king's expedition, its value has been seriously questioned. Nevertheless it raises interesting and important questions. An unnamed Pharaoh, who in view of the subsequent history (I Kings xi. 40) could scarcely have been Sheshonk I. (Shishak), captured the city of Gezer and gave it to his daughter, the wife of king Solomon (I Kings ix. 16). This is the first intimation of Egyptian conquest in Canaan in nearly three hundred years. Sheshonk I. (945–924 B.C., called "Shishak," not "Pharaoh" in I Kings xi. 40, being the first time that the Old Testament gives a personal name to an Egyptian king) about 926 B.C. celebrated an expedition in which, among other places, he pillaged the temple at Jerusalem (I Kings

3. Exodus to the Assyrian Period.

xiv. 25–26). This expedition was not in favor of Jeroboam whom he had harbored (I Kings xi. 40) but against all Canaan. A place which he also ravaged was called "Field of Abram." Again there was a period in which the internal weakness of the government caused a cessation of campaigns in Palestine and Syria. The references of II Chron. xiv. 9–13 to "Zerah the Ethiopian," and of II Kings xvii. 4 to "So" (or Sewe) find no counterparts in the Egyptian records. If the latter was an Egyptian, he must have been a petty ruler in the North at the beginning of the Ethiopian domination in the South. See ASSYRIA, VI., § 10.

4. Period of Assyrian Contact.

With Shabaka (712–700 B.C.) the first king of dynasty XXV began an attempt to ward off the danger from so powerful a neighbor as Assyria, and the peoples of Palestine and Syria were induced to join in an offensive alliance in spite of the realistic prophecy of Isa. xx. Sennacherib, however, defeated the allied forces at Altaku but returned home without reducing Jerusalem. In 688 B.C. Taharka ("Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia") succeeded to the throne. Against him an expedition was led by Esarhaddon in 674, and in the following year a battle was fought that resulted unfavorably to the Assyrian. Again in 670 he returned, and after having reduced Tyre, he conquered Egypt and received the allegiance of many petty princes, among whom Necho of Sais was one. But the withdrawal of Esarhaddon was the signal for the return of Taharka from Ethiopia whither he had fled. Asshurbanipal renewed the expedition and proceeded up the Nile, possibly to Thebes. After his departure a conspiracy arose in the Delta, for the restoration of Taharka, and it was headed by Necho of Sais. When it was suppressed, Necho was sent in chains to Assyria, but later he was pardoned and sent back as viceroy. Tanutamen, son of Shabaka and nephew of Taharka, tried to regain Egypt, and even took possession of Memphis. Again Asshurbanipal marched against Egypt and proceeded to Thebes, which he sacked and destroyed (Nahum iii. 8–10), and finally ended the Ethiopian domination (661 B.C.). Psammetichus I., a son of Necho of Sais, was made king by Asshurbanipal, but after some years, and in consequence of the growing conflict between Babylonia and Assyria, he succeeded in making Egypt quite independent. During his reign there was a revival of the ancient models in all the relations and customs of the land. Necho, his son, in 609, invaded Palestine in an attempt to extend his kingdom to its ancient northern boundary. In 608 he conquered and killed Josiah at Megiddo (II Kings xxiii. 29), and took possession of the country as far as the Euphrates.

5. Babylonian and Later Periods.

After the fall of Assyria the Babylonian conqueror in the person of Nebuchadrezzar threatened Egyptian supremacy in Syria, and in 605 defeated Necho at Carchemish (Jer. xlvi. 1–12). After pursuing Necho to Egypt he made a compact with him by which all of Egypt's Asiatic pretensions were to be abandoned (II Kings xxiv. 7). Necho and his son, Psammetichus II., devoted themselves to the development of Egypt and to the imitation of ancient models in art and literature. Apries (Hophra, 588 B.C.) instigated a confederation of the petty kings of Western Asia which undertook to throw off the Babylonian yoke, but unsuccessfully. Nebuchadrezzar took Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and again in 568 he marched to the Delta as had been foretold by the fugitive Jeremiah (xliii. 8–13). The details of the expedition, however, are unknown. But the country was strong enough to resist the Babylonian forces successfully. In fact the government was so well established that it became a dominant power on the Mediterranean, with varying fortunes till the Persian conquest under Cambyses in 525 B.C. The period from 404 to 342 B.C. saw native rulers again; the Persians returned and ruled till the conquest of Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. This began the Ptolemaic period which lasted till the Roman period beginning in 30 B.C.

5. Religion: The Egyptian religion is a large matter and the subject of much debate. It has been contended by some that it had a monotheistic basis, and by others that it was merely a form of totemism. The original deity seems to have been a local god, its bounds being prescribed by the village, town, city or nomos (county). Such deity was the special patron of the particular place, and to it appeal was made by those of the town. Each such deity took an animal form in which it was supposed to exercise its inherent powers. Each locality was believed to be inhabited by a multitude of inferior spirits, and these spirits were subject to a higher divinity. With the growth of a town or with a change in the capital, a change was made in the dignity of the particular deity under whose protection the city stood. But the most peculiar feature of the Egyptian religion was its syncretism. It seems to have been easy to merge one deity into another, and to attribute the powers assigned to one to another similar being. It is a frequent phenomenon that contradictory qualities are alleged of the same deity in different periods of the history, later attributes being added without the elimination of the earlier. Resulting contradictions seem not to have been noticed. There was evident also a gradual tendency to a simplification by the merging of many into fewer types, as in the case of the sun-god, with whom in the course of centuries a large number of deities who had acquired a more than local significance became identified. Nearly every god in the pantheon had certain distinguishing characteristics which were conventionally denoted by peculiarities of pose, of dress, of head, of ornament or other feature. Upraised arms and kneeling attitude were characteristic of the god of heaven, Shu; the youthful Horus was a child with a curled side-lock and a forefinger at lip. Bes was a dwarf with a large feather head-dress; Osiris had a royal crown flanked by feather plumes; Anubis had the head of the jackal and Horus the head of a hawk; Hathor was a woman with the ears of a calf, and Sebek had the head of a crocodile. About each one of a multitude of such forms there must have been a rich myth-

1. General Features.

ology. The story of Osiris, Isis, and Horus has been preserved after a fashion by Plutarch, but the great mass of the myths has perished. A few, such as the story of the destruction of mankind, have been preserved, but for the most part all that remains is a collection of references to characteristics in the nomenclature of the various gods. But the stories and beliefs on which these appellations rest have disappeared.

The claim for a monotheistic basis of the Egyptian religion rests upon dogmatic assumption or upon phrases and attributions found in divine hymns, prayers or religious texts. But to bear such an interpretation such phrases must be dislocated from their context. It is also necessary to disregard the fact that each city or province had its special tutelary deity with its special circle of subordinate deities, and that the triad, or even the ennead, not the individual without peer or companion, was the unit. The development of the religion up to the time of the pyramid-texts in the fifth dynasty is largely a matter of conjecture and debate. Since that time there has been nothing, except the ill-starred attempt of Amenhotep IV., which bears the slightest resemblance to monotheism, and only such expressions as indicate the headship of a particular god in a particular region, or his supremacy over other gods can be adduced in support. The argument in favor of pantheism is more plausible, but that is too abstract an idea to find lodgment with the Egyptian; he was too realistic. The whole question is one of speculation as to what the course of development was in the period preceding the pyramid-texts, that is in the period before, say, 4000 B.C., for these texts show a form of belief in a multitude of gods which remained practically unchanged through thousands of years. The Egyptian idea of divine service was based upon that of human service. As the king had attendants who dressed him and made his toilet, so the gods had priests to perform the same, and a large part of the service consisted in changing the garments of the images. The offerings presented were ostensibly for the nourishment of the god of the temple, but really for the attendants. There does not seem to have been any such thing as a burnt sacrifice, though quarters of beef are portrayed on the tables of offering along with bread, beer, wine, geese, and other viands. In this may lie the reason why the Egyptians regarded the sacrifices of the Hebrews as an abomination (Ex. viii. 26).

2. Polytheism Dominant.

The religious texts and books of the Egyptians were quite numerous, the chief place being occupied by the so-called "Book of the Dead." There were several recensions of the text, but no stereotyped form and no recognized sequence or fixed number of chapters. The chief purpose of the book was to benefit the dead and to instruct them in the matters of the future life and in the use of magical formulas for the avoidance of the dangers of the underworld. One of the notable chapters (usually numbered cxxv.) contains the "Negative Confession," consisting of forty-two sections each of which is addressed to a separate deity and contains a statement that the deceased had not committed some specified sin or evil deed. The volume is filled with the names of various deities, places or persons, and is a thesaurus of information with regard to the beliefs of the Egyptians. Underlying it all was a persistent belief in man's immortality which colored and determined many Egyptian religious practises. The pyramids and the rock-hewn tombs are witnesses to this faith. In order to insure the continued existence of the soul, the body must be preserved intact as a refuge for the soul, which was believed to possess the power of independent movement and action. When the body was destroyed the soul ceased to exist, hence the necessity for "everlasting" depositories for the dead and the embalming of the body.

3. Religious Texts.

CHARLES RIPLEY GILLETT.

6. Exploration and Excavation: Systematic exploration and excavation and study of the monuments of Egypt began with the Egyptian military campaign of Napoleon in 1798, which was accompanied by a number of competent scientists, artists, and savants, among whom were MM. Jollois and Devilliers, who examined the monuments then accessible. The results were published in memorable form under the auspices of the French Academy in *Description de l'Égypte, ou recueil des observations qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l'expédition de l'armée française* (37 vols., Paris, 1820–1830). These magnificent volumes first acquainted the world with the existing remains of the past civilization of the Nile land. Prosper Jollois' *Journal d'un ingénieur attaché à l'expédition 1798–1802*, is published by G. Maspéro in *Bibliothèque égyptologique* (Paris, 1894) and throws a definite light upon the work of these scientists, since most of the sites since excavated with so large results are mentioned in the *Journal*. Memorable among the material results of the expedition was the Rosetta Stone discovered in Aug., 1799, at Rosetta, east of Alexandria, inscribed in hieroglyphic, hieratic, and Greek, which enabled Champollion to begin decipherment and make the first great contributions to Egyptology (see INSCRIPTIONS). Another expedition, under the Tuscan government supported by Charles X. of France and led by the French Champollion and the Italian Rosellini, the latter a professor at Pisa, went out in 1828, studied anew the monuments in the light of Champollion's achievements with the materials of the first expedition, and carried their researches as far as Nubia. Champollion died in 1832, but Rosellini stayed some years, and the results were published in *Monumente dell' Egitto e della Nubia* (3 vols. of plates, 8 of text, Pisa, 1832 sqq.), the French equivalents in *Monuments de l'Égypte et de Nubie* (4 and 8 vols., Paris, 1835 sqq.).

1. The First Period, 1798–1830.

The next period began in 1832, at first under private enterprise, no great official efforts being made. Among the most notable and useful labors were those of the English engineer F. E. Perring and his associate Col. Howard Vyse, who took accurate measurements of the pyramids, especially those of Gizeh, and laid the foundations for all subsequent

exact knowledge, verified and completed for the Gizeh pyramids by Petrie in 1881–82, results being assured often to one-tenth of an inch.

2. Private and Tuscan-Prussian Work, 1832–50. The object of the building of the pyramids was discovered largely through the investigations of Perring and Vyse. In 1841 Alexander von Humboldt and Karl Josias von Bunsen induced Frederick William IV. of Prussia to send an expedition headed by Karl Richard Lepsius and a strong staff, which carried on work from 1842 into the sixties. Investigation was begun at the pyramids near Memphis and the conclusion was reached that these structures vary in size approximately in proportion to the length of the reign of the king for whose tomb each was prepared; that the tomb was begun at the beginning of the reign and increased in size by symmetrical outside casings as long as the king lived, when a final casing was added. This theory is denied by Petrie (*Ten Years' Digging in Egypt*, New York, n.d., pp. 141–142) but pronounced substantially correct by Steindorff (H. V. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, Philadelphia, 1903, p. 633). Over 130 other tombs were discovered and the materials from them collected, including the inscriptions, for an outline history of Egypt. Explorations were extended southward up the Blue Nile past Khartum, where attention was paid to Ethiopian civilization, and eastward to the ancient mines of Sinai. Among individual achievements was the recovery at Tanis of a trilingual stele carrying the decree of Ptolemy III. Euergetes in hieroglyphic, demotic, and Greek, confirming in general the decipherment begun with the Rosetta Stone. Results were published by Lepsius (12 vols., Berlin, 1849 sqq.). The arrangement was not geographical, as had been the case with previous publications, but historical in the sequence of development as then understood. Thus the outlines of a new treatment were struck out which subsequent work has followed, amended, and filled out.

With Auguste Mariette a new period began, and by the discovery near Memphis in Nov., 1851, of the Serapeum or cemetery of the sacred Apis-bulls intense interest was created. Sixty-four of these tombs were found with a vast amount

3. Mariette, 1851–81. of cultic, memorial, ornamental, and historical material, useful in constructing a picture of life, history, and belief. In 1857 Mariette was made director of the new museum at Cairo, and when permits already issued for excavations expired, he would not have them renewed and permitted no one but himself to dig for antiquities. His own activities were feverish and his excavations so extensive and so scattered that they could not be under his personal supervision. Moreover, the strictly scientific methods of the present had not come into existence, consequently through the carelessness or incapacity of his workmen many objects were irretrievably lost or ruined. No systematic account of the excavations was kept, and a record of work done by Mariette is consequently a desideratum which can never be supplied. His chief aim was to collect fine specimens for his museum, and the accomplishment of thorough work was a secondary end. Yet some of his discoveries were notable: as the statues of the seated scribe, now in the Louvre, and the Sheikh al-Beled ("village chief"), in the Cairo museum; at Abydos the temple of Seti I. and the Seti list of seventy-six royal ancestors with their names and titles; at Denderah, the temple of Hathor; at Edfu, the fine temple of Horus; and under his direction many volumes of the inscriptions recovered and copied were issued.

After Mariette's death in 1881 the direction remained in the hands of the French, but under competent and more generous management such as that of G. Maspéro, E. Grebaut, J. de Morgan, and Victor Loret. Permits to excavate were once more granted to repre-

4. The Recent Period, since 1881. sentatives of other nations and interests, while for the Egyptian government researches were conducted at Luxor, Ombos, and in the Valley of the Kings, in which last place a notable fund of knowledge was accumulated, as it proved to be the hiding-place of the mummies of the kings of the seventeenth and eighteenth dynasties. Since 1883 the Egypt Exploration Fund and since 1893 the Egyptian Research Account (qq.v.) have been continuously at work; both have been favored agencies and their progress has been one of repeated triumphs under such brilliant workers as Edouard Naville, W. M. Flinders Petrie, F Ll. Griffiths and E. A. Gardner. In 1894 the Swiss scholars F J. Gautier and J. Jéquier entered upon work on the pyramids near Dahshur, and the tombs of Amenophis I. and Usertesen I. were recovered. Amélineau's work since 1895 has been momentous, including the recovery of a famous tomb of Osiris and the royal tombs of part of the first dynasty near Abydos. Meanwhile M. Gayet had begun work for the Musée Guimet. M. de Morgan's labor for the Cairo Museum at Abydos, Dahshur, Sakkareh and elsewhere has been continuous and important, especially in the investigation of neolithic interments and the discovery of the tomb of Menes near Nakada. Professor Spiegelberg has carried on a private enterprise for Lord Newberry at Memphis and elsewhere. More recent work has been done for the Germans by H. Schäfer, e.g., at Abusir, where a sun temple of the fifth dynasty was discovered.

The attempt to state the results of all these efforts has already filled hundreds of volumes. Here only the most general or most significant consquences can be given. The general course and extent of Egyptian history have been determined, though with many gaps and with

5. General Results. deficiencies sufficiently indicated by the differences in the chronology as determined by different students shown in the chronological table given above. Yet the dynasties are few of which definite knowledge is not at hand, while the gaps are ever being filled in. The general course of civilization and of development of science, art, and letters in the Nile land is determined even into the prehistoric period, and the investigations have fixed within narrow limits the period of alien civilizations such as the Greek

Mycenæan and Cretan. With this goes considerable light upon the movements and control of Mediterranean commerce and intercourse prior to 1000 B.C. New light is continually directed upon the two riddles of the Egyptian sphinx—the ethnology and language of the valley and delta. The increase in the number of monuments and cultic and social implements on the one hand and of inscriptions and literary remains on the other promise ultimate solution of these two problems. Single questions of importance settled definitely are: the relations of Egypt to Palestine in the fifteenth century B.C. (see AMARNA TABLETS); the situation of the Goshen of the Israelites through the location of Pithom (1883) and possibly Rameses (1906) along the Tanitic branch of the Nile; the relations of Egypt to Greece in the use of Greek mercenaries from the seventh to the fourth century B.C. by the excavations of the sites of Naukratis and Daphnæ (Tahpanhes); the character of the cult of Hathor (1906) through finding an untouched temple of the goddess with a cow sculptured in sandstone as the cultic object—the first discovery of a shrine with its deity and paraphernalia of worship intact; and the recovery of the site of the Onias temple (1906). Among the unexpected results is the recovery of early fragments of classical, Jewish, and Christian literature, including the famous *Logia Jesu* (see AGRAPHA), early bits of the Greek Old and New Testaments, new fragments of Sappho, and Menander, the Epitome of Livy covering several lost books; while of Baruch, Hermas, Pindar, Julius Africanus, Euripides, Æschines, the Iliad and the Odyssey, Plato, Demosthenes, and others, texts, fragmentary to be sure, earlier than any before known have been unearthed. Added to these are a mass of ostraca, accounts, letters, official documents, and other materials of the post-Alexandrine period which has already required a recasting of the history of the Greek language. With the last phase of work and of epoch-making finds the names of Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, David G. Hogarth and the versatile W M. Flinders Petrie are indissolubly connected. See EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

GEO. W GILMORE.

II. Modern Egypt: Egypt fell under the dominion of the Turks in 1517, but retained its independence in great measure. It is now formally dependent on the Sultan, although it has its own prince, who is called Khedive. The present Khedive is Abbas II., crowned 1892. Since 1882 England has exercised actual control, which was secured until further notice by an agreement with France in 1904. The area of the country, which is now officially bounded on the south by Wadi Halfa, amounts, according to Hübner and Juraschek, to 994,275 square kilometers (somewhat less than 400,000 square miles) or a little over three times the area of Great Britain, but only one-thirtieth is fertile and inhabited. The census of 1897, according to the same authorities, showed a population of 9,821,045, a number slightly in excess of that given by the *Almanac de Gotha*, which includes about 113,000 foreigners, consisting mainly of Greeks, English, French, Austrians, and Hungarians. The majority of the English and Germans belong to the Protestant Church. Hübner and Juraschek give the number of Protestants as 11,894, while the *Almanac de Gotha* raises the number, probably with greater correctness, to 24,409. The number of Roman Catholics, according to the former, is 56,343; according to the latter, 61,051. By far the greater number of natives are Mohammedans. The majority of native Christians belong to the Coptic Church (q.v.), which, according to Hübner and Juraschek, numbers 608,446 members. There are also 53,479 "orthodox Greeks"; but no distinction is made between the members of the Orthodox Church proper, over which the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople presides, and those Christians whom that Church regards as heretical and schismatic. The latter are represented by many denominations, especially the Armenian and Syrian Jacobites.

1. Statistics, General and Religious.

The Orthodox Church is under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Alexandria. Egypt was for centuries the most splendid seat of the Oriental Church, but has declined more and more since the invasion of the Arabs. The most famous patriarch of modern times was Cyril Lucar (q.v.), who lived for the most part at Constantinople, where he became ecumenical patriarch in 1620. In 1846 the patriarchal residence was restored to Egypt, and is now at Cairo. The present incumbent of the see of Alexandria is Photios, a man of energy and ambition, who was consecrated in 1900 with the title of "most blessed and all-holy pope (Gk. *papas*) and patriarch of the great city of Alexandria and all Egypt, of Pentapolis and Pelusium, of Libya and Ethiopia." Under him are four titular metropolitans. Formerly the patriarchate had large estates in Rumania, but they were sequestrated some decades ago. It must not be supposed, however, that all the Orthodox who live in Egypt belong to the Church of Alexandria, but only those who settled there long ago, whose number is not over 10,000. Although the immigrant Greeks and Russians take part in the service held by the clergy of the patriarch, they have no rights concerning it. The most important privilege vested in the subjects of the patriarchate is his election, in which the laity take a prominent part. The congregations in Cairo and Alexandria are rich, and supply the patriarch with large means. The first patriarch to return to reside in the country founded schools and hospitals with ecclesiastical funds. The patriarch is aided in the government of the Church by a permanent synod, consisting of the four metropolitans, and a council, or committee, for secular and financial affairs. Some important monasteries belong to the patriarchate, especially the large cloister of St. George in Cairo; the monastery of Sinai is ecclesiastically independent.

2. The Orthodox Greek Church.

The Roman Catholic Church has an influential mission in the country, and since the time of the crusades has nominally a patriarch there, although he actually resides at Rome, where he has the church S. Paolo fuori le Mure. The Uniates have a distinct organization. The Anglican Church is largely represented in the principal cities, and Presbyterian

chapels also exist. German congregations are found at Cairo and Alexandria, where they include the Swiss and Evangelical French.

3. Other Communions.

From 1752 to 1783 the Moravians worked among the Copts, and since 1854 the United Presbyterians of the United States have been engaged in mission work. The Indian prince Dalip Singh (d. 1893), who married an Evangelical Coptic woman, supported the mission, which in 1907 had fifty-three organized congregations and 140 stations. Fifteen ordained missionaries, thirteen lay missionaries (including five medical missionaries), sixteen missionary sisters, thirty ordained native ministers, thirty native auxiliary missionaries, 333 teachers, and thirty-eight colporteurs are among the number now at work. There are 25,500 baptized members, and 6,580 communicants. In 1901 the contributions for church purposes amounted to about $31,650. In the 169 schools 13,406 pupils were taught (including 6,852 Copts and 2,924 Mohammedans), and $31,489 were contributed for educational work. In 1882 a mission among the Mohammedans was begun by the Anglican Church Missionary Society, but its success has not been great. Since 1892 the North African Mission has worked in the same direction in the Nile delta. A small Dutch mission is also at work, as well as the Egyptian General Mission, which has its headquarters in Ireland. See also " Egypt " under title AFRICA, vol. i., p. 67. F. KATTENBUSCH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Articles which cover the whole topic except Modern Egypt are *DB*, i. 653–667; *EB*, ii. 1203–1247. The article in *KL*, i. 256–267 includes Modern Egypt.

On the archeology consult: A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, New York, 1894 (supersedes all earlier works); the various *Reports* and other publications of the two societies treated below, which give results of their operations; the publications of the Mission archéologique française au Caire, Paris, 1885 sqq. (a magnificent series of volumes dealing with various topics); G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Hist. of Art in Ancient Egypt*, 2 vols., London, 1883; W. M. F. Petrie, *Historical Scarabs*, London, 1889; idem, *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt*, New York, 1892; idem, *Egyptian Decorative Art*, ib. 1895; G. Maspero, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, ih. 1891; E. A. W. Budge, *The Mummy: Chapters on Egyptian Funeral Archæology*, Camhridge, 1893; W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern*, Leipsic, 1893; M. Benson and J. Gourlay, *The Temple of Mut in Asher . illustrating the Hist. of Egypt and the Main Religious Ideas of the Egyptians*, London, 1899; J. de Morgan, *Recherches sur les origines de l'Égypte; l'âge de la pierre et les métaux*, Paris, 1895–96; H. Wallis, *Egyptian Pottery*, London, 1898; M. Brodrick and A. A. Morton, *Concise Dictionary of Egyptian Archæology*, ih. 1901; J. Capart, *Les Débuts de l'art en Égypte*, Brussels, 1904, Eng. transl., *Primitive Art in Egypt*, Philadelphia, 1905; F. W. von Bessing, *Monuments of Egyptian Sculpture*, New York, 1906 (typical examples of art arranged chronologically); T. M. Davis, E. Naville, H. Carter, *Theodore M. Davis' Excavations*, New York, 1906; A. H. Gardiner, *Inscription of Mes: Study of Egyptian Judicial Procedure*, ih. 1906; G. Maspero, *Manual of Egyptian Archæology*, ih. 1906; P. E. Newherry, *Scarabs: Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings*, London, 1906; H. Schneider, *Kultur und Denken der alten Aegypter*, Leipsic, 1907; E. A. W. Budge, *The Egyptian Sudan, its History and Monuments*, 2 vols., London, 1907.

On the history it is to he remarked that the earlier works are superseded and should be used only with the greatest care. Consult J. H. Breasted, *A Hist. of Egypt*, New York, 1905 (in connection with this may he employed Breasted's *Ancient Records of Egypt, including the Historical Documents*, 5 vols., Chicago, 1905–06); idem, *History of the Ancient Egyptians*, New York, 1908 (a brief and handy manual); A. Wiedemann, *Aegyptische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1884; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, vol. i., Stuttgart, 1884; idem, *Geschichte des alten Aegyptens*, Berlin, 1887; W. M. F. Petrie, *A Hist. of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Thirtieth Dynasty*, 6 vols., New York, 1894–1905; A. H. Sayce, *The Egypt of the Hebrews and of Herodotus*, ih. 1895; F. G. Fleay, *Egyptian Chronology*, ih. 1899; G. Maspero, *History of the Ancient Peoples of the Classic East*, 3 vols., ih. 1897–1900; E. A. W. Budge, *A Hist. of Egypt*, 8 vols., ih. 1902. On the Greek period, hesides the appropriate sections in works mentioned ahove, consult: J. P. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, London, 1895; M. C. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*, Berlin, 1897. For the Roman period, J. G. Milne, *History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, London, 1899. On the external relations of Egypt, consult W. M. Müller, ut sup., and the literature under AMARNA TABLETS.

On the religion: A. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, New York, 1897 (the hest single work); G. Steindorff, *The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, ih. 1905 (covers the suhject, but largely on the hasis of Herodotus); M. Brimmer, *Egypt: Three Essays on the Religion, Hist., and Art*, Boston, 1891; G. Maspero, *Études de mythologie et d'archéologie*, 4 vols., Paris, 1893–1900; G. St. Clair, *Creation Records in Egypt. Studies in the Book of the Dead*, London, 1898; W M. F. Petrie, *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt*, ih. 1898; E. A. W. Budge, *Egyptian Ideas of a Future Life*, Oxford, 1899; idem, *Egyptian Magic*, ih. 1899; idem, *The Gods of the Egyptians*, 3 vols., London, 1905 (sumptuous and meaty); idem, *Egyptian Heaven and Hell*, ib. 1906; A. H. Sayce, *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, New York, 1903; A. Erman, *Die ägyptische Religion*, Berlin, 1905, Eng. transl., *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, London, 1907; E. Naville, *La Religion des anciens Égyptiens*, Paris, 1906; *DB*, Extra volume, pp. 176–197.

On the literature: For the Book of the Dead, the recension of the British Museum copy was reproduced in color by Griggs, London, 1889; that of the Turin Papyrus was edited by R. Lepsius, Leipsic, 1842; The Book of the Dead was translated in part hy Le P. Renouf for the Society of Biblical Archæology, parts i.–iv., London, 1893–95, completed hy É. Naville, 1907; it has heen translated into English by C. H. S. Davis, New York, 1894, and hy E. A. W. Budge, 3 vols., London, 1898 (text, vocabulary, and translation). An excellent Fr. transl. is by P. Pierret, Paris, 1882. Collections are: K. Piehl, *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1886–1903; *Corpus papyrorum Ægypti*, ed. R. Revillout and A. Eisenlohr, Paris, 1894 sqq.; *Urkunden des aegyptischen Altertums*, ed. G. Steindorff, Leipsic, 1903 sqq. *Egyptian Tales from the Papyri*, 2 series, ed. and transl. by W M. F. Petrie, New York, 1894–95 is of great interest psychologically and from the point of view of folklore. Consult also: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens*, ed. K. Sethe, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1896 sqq.; R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, Leipsic, 1897 sqq. (4 vols. issued); G. Ehers, *Papyrus Ebers*, 2 vols., ih. 1875; I. Myer, *The Oldest Books in the World*, London, 1900; A. Erman, *Aegyptische Chrestomathie*, New York, 1895.

On exploration and excavation consult: G. Steindorff, in H. V. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, Philadelphia, 1903; W. M. F. Petrie, *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt*, London, 1892; the *Annual Archæological Reports* of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1890 sqq., furnish accounts not only of the work of that association but of the discoveries made hy other investigators; *Bibliothèque égyptologique*, Paris, 1893 sqq., contains many memoirs of a historical nature concerning exploration and excavation.

On Modern Egypt: De Chahroe, *Essai sur les mœurs des habitants modernes de l'Égypte*, in *Description de l'Égypte*, ii. 2, pp. 361–526, Paris, 1822; J. Silbernagl, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämmtlicher Kirchen des Orients*, Landshut, 1907; H. Stephan, *Das heutige Aegypten*, Leipsic, 1872; M. Lüttke, *Aegyptens neue Zeit*, Leipsic, 1873 (the most comprehensive hook for ecclesiastical matters); O. Schneider, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche Aegyptens*, Dresden, 1874 (important); O. Werner, *Orbis terrarum catholicus*, pp. 195 sqq., Freiburg, 1890; F. Kattenhusch, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde*, i. 170 sqq., Freiburg,

1892; Abu Salih, *Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, London, 1895; A. von Fircks, *Aegypten*, Berlin, 1895; E. L. Butcher, *Story of the Church of Egypt*, London, 1897 (good for the modern period); A. Watson, *American Mission in Egypt*, 1854–96, Pittsburg, 1898; A. B. Edwards, *Pharaohs, Fellahs and Explorers*, New York, 1891; M. Fowler, *Christian Egypt*, London, 1901; K. Baedeker, *Egypt*, London, 1902; K. Beth, *Die orientalische Christenheit der Mittelmeerländer*, Berlin, 1902; H. Gundert, *Die evangelische Mission, ihre Länder, Völker und Arbeiten*, pp. 232 sqq., Stuttgart, 1903; O. Hübner, *Geographisch-statistische Tabelle aller Länder der Erde*, ed. F. von Juraschek, Frankfort, 1907; *Gothaischer genealogischer Kalender*, Gotha, 1906; C. R. Watson, *Egypt and the Christian Crusade*, Philadelphia, 1907, and the literature under Coptic Church.

EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND: A society founded in 1882 by Miss Amelia B. Edwards, Sir Erasmus Wilson, and others to carry on systematic and scientific research of ancient Egypt. The success of the undertaking was assured when the promoters obtained the services of the well-known Swiss Egyptologist, Édouard Naville, and the distinguished explorer, W H. Flinders Petrie (since 1892 Edwards professor of Egyptology, University College, London). The results achieved may be classed under three heads: (1) Biblical, that is throwing light on the Old-Testament narrative; (2) classical, showing the connection between Greece and Egypt at a very early period; (3) purely Egyptian, illustrating the history, religion, arts, and literature of ancient Egypt. During the season of 1882–83 M. Naville excavated the site of Pithom-Succoth and determined the starting-point of the Exodus; the city was built in the reign of Rameses the Great, the oppressor of the Hebrews. In 1883–84 Prof. Petrie excavated Zoan (cf. Num. xiii. 22), but did not reach the Biblical city, as many centuries of later builders had buried it so deep that the cost and labor of reaching it was prohibitive. In the following season Prof. Petrie excavated at Tell Defenneh (the Biblical Tahpanhes), "The Palace of the Jew's Daughter," and found traces of the pavement before the entry of Pharaoh's house (cf. Jer. xliii. 8–10). In 1885 M. Naville identified the location of the Land of Goshen at Saft el-Henneh (cf. Ex. viii. 22). The three chief classical sites are those of Naucratis, Tanis, and Tell Defenneh (Gk. *Daphnai*). Naucratis was the city in which Psammetichus II. allowed his Greek mercenaries to settle. At Tanis remains of many Roman houses were found; that of a lawyer named Bak-akhiu of c. 174 was especially rich in papyri and objects of the Greco-Roman period. At Tell Defenneh traces of the camp of the Greek mercenaries were found. Other sites excavated have been: the city of Onias and Tell el-Yehudiyeh ("Mound of the Jew"); the great temple of Bubastis, where monuments of the Hyksos, the shepherd kings who ruled in the time of Joseph (see Egypt), were found; Ahnas el-Medineh, Deir el-Bahari, the great temple of Queen Hatshepsu, and the eleventh-dynasty temple of Mentuhetep adjoining; Deshasheh, Dendereh, and Abydos.

There are two auxiliary branches of the Fund, (1) the Archeological Survey, which copies wall sculptures and the like which have been uncovered and thus are liable to injury; and (2) the Greco-Roman Branch, established to search for papyri. The Archeological Survey has done excellent work at Beni Hasan, el-Bersheh, Saqqareh, Sheikh Said, Deir el-Gebrawi, and el-Amarna. To the excavators of the Greco-Roman Branch, Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, are due the recovery of the "sayings of Jesus" (see Agrapha), many portions of the Gospels, as well as invaluable Greek papyri. The principal site worked by the Greco-Roman Branch has been Oxyrhynchus. Emily Paterson.

Bibliography: The following is a list of the publications of the Fund: I. The Memoirs: 1, for 1883–84, by E. Naville, *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus;* 2, for 1884–85, by W. M. F. Petrie, *Tanis*, part i.; 3, for 1885–86, by W. M. F. Petrie, *Naukratis*, part i.; 4, for 1886–87, by E. Naville, *Goshen and the Shrine of Saft-el-Henneh;* 5, for 1887–88, by W. M. F. Petrie, F. Ll. Griffith and A. S. Murray, *Tanis*, part ii., *Tell Defenneh*, and *Tell Nebesheh:* 6, for 1888–89, by E. A. Gardiner and F. Ll. Griffith, *Naukratis*, part ii.; 7, extra volume, by E. Naville and F. Ll. Griffith, *The City of Onias and the Mound of the Jew;* 8, for 1889–90, by E. Naville, *Bubastis;* 9, extra volume, by F. Ll. Griffith and W M. F. Petrie, *Two Hieroglyphic Papyri from Tanis;* 10, for 1890–91, by E. Naville, *The Festival Hall of Osorkon II. (Bukastis)*; 11, for 1891–92, by E. Naville, J. J. Tylor and F. Ll. Griffith, *Ahnas el-Medineh*, and *The Tomb of Paheri at el-Kab;* 12–14, 16, 19 and 27, for 1892–95, 1896–97, 1899–1900 and 1904–05, by E. Naville, *Deir el-Bahari*, Introductory and parts i.–v.; 15, for 1895–96, by W. M. F. Petrie, *Deshasheh;* 17, for 1897–98, by W. M. F. Petrie, *Dendereh;* 18, for 1898–99, by W M. F. Petrie, *Royal Tombs of the First Dynasty;* 20, extra volume, by W. M. F. Petrie, *Diospolis Parva;* 21, for 1900–01, by W. M. F. Petrie, *The Royal Tombs of the Earliest Dynasties*, part ii.; 22 and 24, for 1901–03 by W M. F. Petrie, *Abydos*, parts i.–ii.; 23, extra volume, by D. Randall-MacIver, A. C. Mace and F. Ll. Griffith, *El-Amrah and Abydos;* 25, extra volume, by C. T. Currelly, E. R. Ayrton and A. E. P. Weigall, *Abydos*, part iii.; 26, for 1903–04, by W. M. F. Petrie, *Ehnasya;* 28, for 1905–06, by E. Naville and H. R. Hall, *The Eleventh Dynasty Temple at Deir el Bahari.*

II. The Archeological Survey: 1–2, for 1890–92, by P. E. Newberry and G. W. Fraser, *Beni Hasan*, parts i.–ii.; 3, for 1892–93, by P. E. Newberry, *El-Bersheh*, part i.; 4, for 1893–94, by F. Ll. Griffith and P. E. Newberry, *El-Bersheh*, part ii.; 5 and 7, for 1894–95 and 1896–97, by F. Ll. Griffith, *Beni Hasan*, parts iii.–iv.; 6, for 1895–96, by F. Ll. Griffith, *Hieroglyphs from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund;* 8–9, for 1897–99, by N. de G. Davies and F Ll. Griffith, *The Mastabah of Ptahhetep and Akhethetep at Saqqareh*, parts i.–ii.; 10, for 1899–1900, by N. de G. Davies, *The Rock Tombs of Sheikh Saïd;* 11–12, for 1900–02, by N. de G. Davies, *The Rock Tombs of Deir el-Gebrawi*, parts i.–ii.; 13–15, for 1902–05, *The Rock Tombs of el-Amarna*, parts i.–iii.

III. Greco-Roman Branch: 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, for 1897–99, 1902–04, 1906–07, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, parts i.–v.; 3, for 1899–1900, by D. G. Hogarth, B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *Fayum Towns and their Papyri;* 4, 1900–02, by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt and J. G. Smyly, *The Tebtunis Papyri;* 7, for 1904–06, *The Hibeh Papyri.*

IV. Annual Archeological Reports on the seasons' work, running from 1890–91 to date.

V. Special publications: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: *"Sayings of Our Lord"* and *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel; Atlas of Ancient Egypt; Guide to Temple of Deir el-Bahari;* W. E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca.*

EGYPTIAN RESEARCH ACCOUNT: A society carrying on archeological research in Egypt, which had its beginnings about 1893, when through the exertions of Prof. W M. Flinders Petrie a fund was collected to assist students in Egypt. For eleven years the fund (the "Research Account"), continued by subscriptions, was administered by Professor Petrie as a personal trust, and the students who

shared in it worked in accord with his excavations latterly conducted for the Egypt Exploration Fund (q.v.). In 1905 a different basis was found desirable, and the work was organized and expanded at a public meeting of subscribers and friends held in London. Regulations were adopted stating the name of the new association to be the "Egyptian Research Account and British School of Archeology in Egypt." The office was appointed at University College, London. The objects were defined as follows:

a. To conduct excavations and pay all expenses incidental thereto.
b. To discover and acquire antiquities and to distribute the same to public museums.
c. To publish works.
d. To hold exhibitions.
e. To promote the training and assistance of students.

All of these objects to be carried on in relation to Egypt, meaning in general the Nile valley, but with occasional extension to any part of the former kingdom of Egypt.

All receipts from subscriptions, bequest, or sale of books are applied solely to the objects mentioned above, and no expenses are incurred for offices or management. Antiquities not claimed by the Egyptian government are divided among subscribers and among public museums in proportion to the amounts contributed in their respective localities. The management of the society is in the hands of an executive committee appointed by a general committee, which in turn is appointed by the subscribers at an annual general meeting held in London. A director has charge of the work in the field and the work of students. He is the professor of Egyptology in University College, London, if he choose to fill the position; if not, appointment is made by the general committee on nomination of the executive committee. Professor Petrie has continued as director. Late work of the society has been excavation at Tell el-Yehudiyeh, twenty miles north of Cairo, where it is thought the celebrated Hyksos capital Avaris has been discovered, and also the town and temple of Onias, the Jewish high priest who fled to Egypt about 150 B.C. The exploration of Memphis is now in progress, and it is estimated that fully fifteen years will be required to excavate the temple sites alone, apart from the city. The following is the complete list of the society's publications, and indicates the locality and character of the work done since its beginning:

i. 1895. J. E. Quibell, *Ballas.*
ii. 1896. J. E. Quibell, *The Ramesseum.*
iii. 1897. J. E. Quibell, *El Kab.*
iv. 1898. W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Hierakontopolis*, i.
v. 1899. F. W. Green and J. E. Quibell, *Hierakontopolis*, ii.
vi. 1900. J. Garstang, *El Arabah.*
vii. 1901. J. Garstang, *Mahasna.*
viii. 1902. A. St. G. Caulfeild, *The Temple of the Kings.*
ix. 1903. M. A. Murray, *The Osireion.*
x. 1904. M. A. Murray, *Saqqara Mastabas*, i. L. Loat, *Gurob.*
xi. 1905. Hilda Petrie, *Saqqara Mastabas*, ii.
xii. 1906. W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities.*
xiii. 1907. W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Gizeh and Rifeh.*
xiv. 1908. W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Athribis and Memphis, I.*

EHRENFEUCHTER, ê″ren-fȯiH′ter, **FRIEDRICH AUGUST EDUARD:** German mediating theologian; b. at Leopoldshafen (near Carlsruhe) Dec. 15, 1814; d. at Göttingen Mar. 20, 1878. He was educated at Mannheim and Heidelberg, and from 1835 to 1839 was instructor in religion at Mannheim. In 1841 he was appointed vicar at Weinheim, and then became court and municipal vicar at Carlsruhe. He attracted attention by his *Theorie des christlichen Kultus* (Hamburg, 1840) and *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit* (Heidelberg, 1845), and in 1845 accepted a call to Göttingen, where he remained until his death, despite calls to Heidelberg, Leipsic, Carlsruhe, and Dresden. In 1849 he became full professor of theology, in 1856 abbot of Bursfelde, and in 1859 counselor of the supreme consistory and member of the Hanoverian council for religion and education. The chief subject of his lectures was practical theology in all its branches, although he also taught theological introduction, the philosophy of religion, apologetics, the life of Jesus, interpretation of the Pastoral Epistles, modern church history, and similar topics. Both as a lecturer and preacher, he was extremely popular. Distinctly irenic in temperament and unable to conceive of a conflict between science and the Church, theory and practise, or ecclesiastical polity and academic teaching, Ehrenfeuchter was exposed to attacks both from conservatives and radicals, particularly in the neo-Lutheran controversy which raged in Hanover in 1853 and the following years. He was a prolific writer, his principal works, in addition to those already mentioned, being: *Zeugnisse aus dem akademischen Gottesdienst in Göttingen* (Göttingen, 1849–52); *Zur Geschichte des Katechismus* (1857); *Die praktische Theologie* (1859); *Die Katechismusfrage in der hannoverschen Landeskirche* (1862); and *Christentum und moderne Weltanschauung* (1876). He was one of the founders of the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (Stuttgart and Gotha, 1856–78). (J. A. WAGENMANN†.)

EICHHORN, aiH′hȯrn, **JOHANN ALBRECHT FRIEDRICH:** Prussian minister of worship; b. at Wertheim (20 m. w. of Würzburg) Mar. 2, 1776; d. at Berlin Jan. 16, 1856. He served as an army-officer in the war of liberation in 1813, and afterward took an active part in promoting the welfare of his country. He soon occupied various prominent positions, and when Frederick William IV. ascended the throne of Prussia in 1840, Eichhorn was appointed minister of worship and education. As the state governed the universities and regulated the appointment of its teachers, the influence of the ruling policy upon the destinies of scientific efforts was inevitable, and showed itself especially in philosophy and theology. The tendency to substitute a positive philosophy in place of the negative became a great stumbling-block to theological candidates and ministers. The result of this policy was an opposition which in 1842 nourished two hostile parties.

In 1843 Eichhorn undertook the formation of synods in the eastern provinces, and these district-synods, composed only of ministers and meeting in 1843, advocated an increase of pastoral forces, better preparation of the candidates, the formation of presbyteries, greater interest of the congregations in the election of ministers, and a more definite

adherence on the part of the clergy to the Augsburg Confession. In 1844 the six eastern provincial synods were convened and advocated the restoration of consistories in their ecclesiastical quality and the establishment of other synodical institutions. In 1846 at the instance of Prussia, conferences, represented by delegates from all the twenty-six Protestant governments, were held (Berlin, Jan. 3), but they accomplished little except to serve as preludes for the Eisenach conferences (see EISENACH CONFERENCE).

In regard to the universities, Eichhorn declined to favor any particular doctrine, although he checked pantheistic speculation and deistic naturalism; moderate tendencies, on the other hand, were given free scope. He formed many plans, and efforts were made to acquaint the public through the press with the intentions of the government. But the revolution of Mar., 1848, made an end of all these plans and Eichhorn withdrew from public life. In his administration a special section was formed for Roman Catholic interests, and the bishops were permitted to communicate freely with Rome. (W. HOLLENBERG†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Eilers, *Zur Beurteilung des Ministeriums Eichhorn*, Berlin, 1849; O. Mejer, in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1877, parts 2 and 3; H. von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, v. 229 sqq., Leipsic, 1894.

EICHHORN, JOHANN GOTTFRIED: Biblical scholar; b. at Dörrenzimmern (near Künzelsau, 24 m. n.e. of Heilbronn) in the principality of Hohenlohe-Oehringen, Oct. 16, 1752; d. at Göttingen June 14, 1827. His father was pastor at Dörrenzimmern. After preparatory studies in the town school at Weikersheim and the gymnasium at Heilbronn, he studied at Göttingen, 1770–74, under Michaelis, Walch, Miller, Schlözer, and Heyne. He became rector of the gymnasium at Ohrdruff, near Gotha, in 1774. The next year he was appointed ordinary professor of Oriental languages at Jena. In this period he published a number of treatises on the history and literature of the Orient, as well as of particular Mohammedan dominions. In the main, however, he devoted himself to the Biblical sciences. In the *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* (Leipsic, 1777–86), edited by himself, he did much which was preliminary work to his *Einleitung ins Alte Testament* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1780–83). This work, which is distinguished alike by youthful enthusiasm, synoptical arrangement, comprehensive scholarship, and solid investigation, gained universal acceptance, and appeared in the fourth edition (5 vols., 1823–26). In it Eichhorn made Introduction a literary-historic science. A proof of the lively interest with which he pursued the study of Biblical literature is furnished by *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur* (10 vols., Leipsic, 1787–1803).

In 1788 he went to Göttingen as ordinary professor of philosophy; and here he exhibited until shortly before his death an exceedingly diversified activity, combined with rare powers of labor and indefatigable industry. His numerous lectures embraced not only the Biblical sciences, but also the history and literary life of ancient and modern times. At the same time he embodied the material of his lectures in extensive works issued in rapid succession (cf. Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, v. 235 for list of his historical works). Nevertheless, the principal part of his activity was directed to Biblical science. Of his additional theological writings may be mentioned: *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1791); *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Leipsic, 1795); *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1804–12), containing detailed researches with reference to the origin of the Gospels; *Die hebräischen Propheten* (3 vols., Göttingen, 1816–19); and a metrical translation of the Book of Job (Leipsic, 1800; 2d ed., 1824). His lectures in the Göttingen Society of Sciences are also noteworthy. After Heyne's death (1812) he edited the *Göttinger gelehrten Anzeigen*, for which he wrote many literary notices.

The verdict upon Eichhorn and his works became less favorable not long after his death; his historical writings, which were really mere sketches, were found wanting in thorough investigation and painstaking conscientiousness. Still more sharply were his theological works censured, because the more accurate knowledge of the characteristics of this or that particular composition was lacking; and his research was not sufficiently free from prejudice. It may likewise be said against his exegesis that it neglected the psychologic element, and frequently explained away the profound content of the Biblical records by means of so called "natural" elucidation. His merit remains, however, in the fact that he not only vindicated the Bible against the ridicule of its enemies, but that far and wide he awakened love for the Biblical writings, especially the Old-Testament Scriptures, and the zeal to examine them carefully.

CARL BERTHEAU.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Saalfeld, *Geschichte der Universität Göttingen*, pp. 332 sqq., Hanover, 1820; H. Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands*, i. 356 sqq., Neustadt, 1831; H. Ewald, *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft*, i. 26 sqq., Göttingen, 1849; *ADB*, v. 731 sqq.; C. H. H. Wright, *Introduction to O. T.*, London, 1890; C. A. Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, passim, New York, 1899.

EICHHORN, KARL FRIEDRICH: German jurist; son of Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, b. at Jena Nov. 20, 1781; d. at Cologne July 5, 1854. He studied law at Göttingen, Wetzlar and Vienna. In 1803 he commenced his academic activity at Göttingen, was appointed professor of law at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1805, and was called in 1811 to Berlin. He served in the war of 1813, and four years later, at the wish of his father, accepted a call to Göttingen. He retired on account of ill-health in 1829, but in 1831 returned to Berlin, lectured for a year, then devoted his time partly to his high offices in civil administration, and partly to literary pursuits. He withdrew entirely from public life in 1847, and, after residing four years on his estate at Ammern (near Tübingen), removed to Cologne, where he spent the remainder of his life. Eichhorn was regarded as the foremost of the historical school of German jurists, and wrote a number of legal works which still take high rank. In the domain of canon law he wrote *Grundsätze des Kirchenrechts der katholischen und der evange-*

lischen Religionspartei in Deutschland (2 vols., Göttingen, 1831–33); *Gutachten für die Domgemeinde zu Bremen* (Hanover, 1831); and *Ueber die spanische Sammlung der Quellen des Kirchenrechts* in the *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie* (Berlin, 1833–34) and in the *Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft*, xi. (C. T. G. von Scheurl.)

Bibliography: F. von Schulte, *Karl Friedrich Eichhorn, sein Leben und Wirken*, Stuttgart, 1884; J. C. Bluntschli and K. Brater, *Staats-Wörterbuch*, iii. 237 sqq., ib. 1858; *Preussische Jahrbücher*, xxxvi (1875), 22 sqq.; *ADB*, vi. 469 sqq.

EICHSTAETT, aih'stät, **BISHOPRIC OF:** A German bishopric named from a city of Germany, 42 m. w.s.w. of Regensburg. The diocese was established by St. Boniface, and in 740 had a monastery on the wooded height above the Altmühl. On Oct. 22, 741, the Anglo-Saxon Willibald (q.v.), who was the abbot of this cloister, was consecrated bishop by Boniface, primarily for missionary work among the neighboring Wends. The actual diocese, however, first came into existence two years later, when Odilo of Bavaria was obliged to cede the northern portion of his domains to Karlman and Pepin, whereupon, to secure the incorporation of the new possession in Frankish territory, the Frankish district of Suala was united with it to form a bishopric. The diocese lost a small portion of its territory when the see of Bamberg was established (1015), but the modern diocese practically corresponds to the ancient. (A. Hauck.)

Bishop Gebhard I. (1042–57) became first an imperial minister of great force, and then pope as Victor II., still, however, retaining his German bishopric and for a time, as administrator of the Empire after the death of Henry III., uniting the highest temporal and spiritual power. Few events of general interest occurred until the episcopate of William of Reichenau (1464–96), whose achievements in statesmanship, economic and intellectual improvements, and building were notable; the University of Ingolstadt was now founded, with William for its first chancellor. The Reformation made marked headway in the diocese in spite of the stalwart opposition of Bishop Martin of Schaumberg (1560–90), who founded at Eichstätt the first seminary in Germany as prescribed by the Council of Trent. A period of great prosperity for the diocese was the episcopate of Conrad of Gemmingen (1593–1612), but the Swedish army laid it in ruins and burned the see city in 1634. The secularization of 1802 divided the diocese between Bavaria, Prussia, and Duke Ferdinand of Tuscany, until in 1805 the fragments were reunited under Bavarian rule. Bishop Joseph von Stubenberg (1790–1824), though no longer a temporal magnate, recovered the full extent of his diocese in the Concordat of 1817, and many evidences of spiritual life were shown during the remainder of the nineteenth century.

Bibliography: Sources for history are: Gundechari, *Liber pontificalis Eichstetensis, 741–1074*, ed. L. C. Bethmann in *MGH, Script.*, vii (1846), 239 sqq.; the same volume, pp. 253 sqq., contains *Anonymus Haserensis de episcopis Eichstetensibus, 741–1058; Gesta episcoporum Eichstetensium 1279–1445*, *MGH, Script.*, xxv (1880), 590–609. Consult: M. Lefflad, *Regesten der Bischöfe von Eichstätt 741–1297*, Eichstätt, 1871–74; J. Sax, *Geschichte des Hochstifts und der Stadt Eichstätt*, ib. 1858; Hauck, *KD*, i. 518–519.

EINHARD, ain'hārt (**EGINHARD**): Frankish historian and ecclesiastic; b. in the district of the Main, Lower Franconia, about 770; d. at Seligenstadt (15 m. e.s.e. of Frankfort) Mar. 14, 840. He received his earliest education in the monastery of Fulda, and was presented by the abbot Baugolf (779–802) at the court of Charlemagne, where he enjoyed the instruction of Alcuin, devoting himself especially to mathematics and architecture, and being appointed inspector of the royal buildings. He was likewise one of the trusted counselors of Charlemagne, and in 806 was sent to Rome to secure the pope's sanction of the division of the realm as proposed by the emperor. He retained his position with Charlemagne's son and successor, Louis, who entrusted him with the education of his son Lothair, although he later became a strong opponent of the evil influence of the empress Judith. In 829 he fell seriously ill, and in the following year left the court. He then retired to Seligenstadt, but in 833 he was at the court of Lothair to do him homage. His chief interest, however, was the development of Mühlheim on the Main, which he renamed Seligenstadt on account of the relics of Saints Marcellinus and Peter, which he brought thither from Rome in 827.

The importance of Einhard as a historian has been much overrated, his perfection of form and diction concealing his inaccuracies. His *Vita Caroli Magni* (Eng. transl. by W Glaister, London, 1877), which is modeled on Suetonius, and draws its political portions from the *Annales Einhardi*, was written shortly after the death of the emperor, and was at once most widely circulated. His letters, which extend only from 825 to 840 and are for the most part undated, are valuable historical documents and are characterized by clarity and simplicity, but his *Translatio sanctorum Marcellini et Petri* is filled with incredible miracles, though it is not without importance as a source for culture-history. (Wilhelm Altmann.)

Bibliography: *NA*, xi (1886), 235–238 contains his *De adoranda cruce*, and xii (1887), 263 sqq. his *Epistolæ*, the latter also in *MPL*, civ.; the *Vita Karoli*, ed. G. H. Pertz, is in *MGH, Script.*, ii (1829), 426–463, thence reprinted in *MPL*, xcvii. and was also edited by A. Holder, Freiburg, 1882. A rich bibliography is given in A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi*, pp. 395–397, Berlin, 1896; also in J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, pp. 163–166, 200–216, Carlsruhe, 1840. Consult: J. Frese, *De Einhardi vita et scriptis*, Berlin, 1846; H. Schneider, *Das Leben Eginhards*, Bamberg, 1861; E. Dünzelmann, *Einhard und seine Werke*, in *NA*, ut sup., ii (1877), 491–499; M. Boudois, *La Translation des saints Marcellin et Pierre. Étude sur Einhard et sa vie politique 827–834*, Paris, 1907; *DCB*, ii. 64–65.

EINSIEDELN, ain'zî-deln (**MARIA EINSIEDELN**): A town of Switzerland (9 m. e.n.e. of Schwyz), containing (1900) about 4,000 inhabitants, and famous as a place of Roman Catholic pilgrimage. Monastic life there dates back to the ninth century, and is connected with the legend of St. Meginrad or Meinrad, who is said to have come from the region near Rottenburg or Hechingen. He first lived in a cell, perhaps at Bollingen near Rap-

persweil, but yielding to his desire for a hermit's life, is said to have gone to the summit of Mount Etzel, and thence to the still more impenetrable wilderness of the mountain forests. There he is said to have tamed two ravens, which, when he was murdered by robbers in 861, followed the criminals to Zurich and convicted them of the crime. It was not until the tenth century, however, that a monastery was erected in this region, when Benno and Eberhard are said to have made the first attempts to gather monks about the deserted cell of Meinrad. Authentic history begins with 947, when Otto I. granted immunity to the cell and to Eberhard, and allowed the free choice of an abbot. Otto I., Otto II., and Henry II. gave rich gifts to the cloister, and until the thirteenth century the control was in the hands of the counts of Rappersweil. After the time of Rudolf, on the other hand, it was controlled by the house of Austria, and was accordingly involved in the struggles between the Swiss Confederacy and the Hapsburgs. The Sempach war broke all bonds which held Einsiedeln to Austria, and after the end of the fourteenth century the monastery belonged to the Canton of Schwyz, although it was decaying rapidly when Zwingli was its parish priest.

The Zurich Reformation depopulated Einsiedeln, but under the administration of the first civil abbot, Joachim Eichhorn (1544–69), it revived, and in the seventeenth century, during the rule of Placidus Reymann, the *Documenta archivii Einsidlensis* were printed, while the librarian of the monastery, Christof Hartmann, wrote its history in his *Annales Heremi* (Freiburg, 1612). The monastery was burned repeatedly, but underwent no essential change until 1798, when it was entirely destroyed by the invasion of the French and the establishment of the Helvetian Republic. In 1801 its restoration was begun and its importance steadily increased, until at its millennial celebration in 1861, it contained nearly 100 monks, and a daughter house was founded in the United States by Abbot Heinrich at St. Meinrad, Ind., in 1854.

Einsiedeln is especially famous as a center of pilgrimage from Switzerland, the neighboring districts of Germany, and from France and Austria. These pilgrimages began in the tenth century, and in 1895 reached the number of 210,000. The chief day is Sept. 14, regarded as the date of the divine dedication of the church in 948. The center of devotion is a statue of the Virgin, originally flesh-colored, but blackened by the smoke of the lights and lamps which burn continually. It stands in a small chapel in the church of the cloister, which, like all the buildings, was erected in the eighteenth century. (G. Meyer von Knonau.)

Bibliography: O. Ringholz, *Wallfahrtsgeschichte unserer lieben Frau von Einsiedeln*, Freiburg, 1896; idem, *Geschichte des fürstlichen Benediktinerstiftes . von Einsiedeln*, Einsiedeln, 1902 sqq. (in progress); A. Kuhn, *Der jetzige Stiftsbau Maria-Einsiedeln*, ib. 1885. Earlier materials will be found in T. von Mohr's *Regesten der Archive in der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft*, vol. i., Bern, 1848; *Liber Heremi*, ed. G. Morel, in *Geschichtsfreund*, vol. i., Einsiedeln, 1843; G. von Wyss, *Ueber die Antiquitates monasterii Einsidlensis und den Liber Heremi*, in *Jahrbuch für schweizerische Geschichte*, vol. x., 1885.

EISENACH CONFERENCE (KONFERENZ, EVANGELISCH-KIRCHLICHE): A gathering of German Protestants which has met at Eisenach, usually every other year shortly after Whitsuntide, since 1852, forming at present the only official bond between the Evangelical State Churches of Germany. The corporate name of the conference is Evangelisch-Kirchliche Konferenz.

Origin and Purpose.

As early as 1846 at the instance of the king of Württemberg a conference of delegates from the German State Churches met in Berlin to find ways and means for establishing a more intimate connection. Owing to the disturbances of 1848, the cause made little progress, but it was revived in 1850 and 1851. The church authorities agreed upon an order of business for a periodically recurring conference of delegates "to discuss freely, upon the basis of the Confession, the more important questions of church life and to form a bond of union, without interfering with the independence of each individual State Church, and to promote the uniform development of their conditions." The conference met for the first time at Eisenach June 3, 1852, under the presidency of Court Preacher Carl (von Grüneisen q.v.) of Stuttgart to whose efforts chiefly it owed its existence. Twenty-four church governments were presented. In later meetings the authorities of all German State Churches have taken part, including Austria. The conference lasts about eight days and is usually opened on Thursday in Trinity week by a service in the chapel of the Wartburg. The archives used to be in the Luther room of the Wartburg, but are now in the grand-ducal castle in Eisenach. The expenses are met by contributions from the different states which take part.

Topics of Discussion.

Although originally the purpose of the conference was to aim at harmony in principles of church administration by purely advisory measures, in the course of time it has undertaken executive functions with the tacit approval of the church authorities. A revision of the liturgies was advocated as early as 1852, but was found impracticable on a large scale owing to the difference of confession. Questions which touch the church service were discussed, however, as the introduction of passion-services in Lent (1855) and the restitution and revival of catechization (1865). Attention was also given to the education of clergymen and the administration of their office, as in the discussions concerning the order of promotion in 1857 and 1859, pastors' colloquies in 1863, and other similar questions. Consultations were also held on the inspection of the administration and life of clergymen (1852 and 1853), the secret of the confessional (1857 and 1859), and the cooperation of congregations in filling clerical positions (1855). Other subjects of discussion have been: the advisability of supplementing the episcopal form of government with presbyteries and synods (1852, 1874, 1878, 1880); the question of marriages between Evangelicals and Roman Catholics (1853); marriage and divorce (1855, 1857, 1868); the attitude of the church authorities to the protectorate

of the nobility (1861); the taxation of congregations (1874); church discipline (1857); the treatment of sects (1852, 1855, 1884); religious instruction in secondary schools (1868); the introduction of a Biblical text-book instead of the whole Bible in primary and secondary schools (1898); and the inspection of religious instruction in secondary schools (1900). The topic of Christian charity was brought up in discussions on aid for emigrants (1855, 1872, and 1894), the organization of charities (1865), Christian work in war (1868 and 1870), furtherance of foreign and home missions (1872), and care of dismissed prisoners (1892). As a result of a recommendation of the conference a collection for German Evangelicals in foreign countries is now taken up every other year in most of the German State churches.

Practical Results.

The resolutions following all these discussions were, of course, not legally binding; but the opinions of the most prominent theologians and jurists, as expressed in the papers and reports of the conference, had a permanent value; and still more valuable was the personal intercourse of men charged with church administration from all parts of the country. And the conference was not satisfied with mere theoretical discussions; it was drawn by an inner necessity to productive work for the common interests of Evangelical Germany. In this connection may be mentioned the practical impulse given in 1859 to the organization of associations for the cultivation of religious art, the regulations for the building of Evangelical churches (1861 and 1898), the propositions for getting up a uniform almanac for the German Evangelical Church (1868, 1870) and selecting daily lectionaries from the Bible for use at home and in the Church (1868). *Deutsches Evangelisches Institut* in Jerusalem, an enterprise of the German Evangelical Churches that had its inception in the conference of 1900, may also be mentioned.

The desire to publish the results of its discussions soon led to the founding of the *Allgemeines Kirchenblatt für das evangelische Deutschland*, which, besides the protocols of the conference, compiles the laws and regulations of general interest enacted by the German Evangelical Church authorities. It forms the most complete collection of documents for modern church law in the German Evangelical Church. The question of church statistics was discussed in 1859, and resulted in the volume *Zur kirchlichen Statistik des evangelischen Deutschlands im Jahre 1862* (Stuttgart, 1865). Since 1880 such statistics have been published regularly. In 1861 the revision of Luther's translation of the Bible was advocated. It was decided to procure a uniform text on the basis of a received text of the Canstein Bbile Institute, with due regard to the original editions of Luther's Bible, and to modern scholarship. The revised New Testament appeared in 1867 and was approved by the conference in 1868. In 1870 the revision of the Old Testament was undertaken and in 1883 appeared the so-called *Probebibel*. The entire work was completed and accepted by the conference in 1892. At its first meeting the conference decided upon a selection of the best hymns, and the execution of the plan was entrusted to such hymnologists as Vilmar, Bähr, Wackernagel, Daniel, and Geffken. Their work, consisting of 150 *Kernlieder*, was approved by the conference in 1853, and generally appreciated, but the hymns have not come into common use, principally because the selection confined itself too exclusively to older periods. In 1878 the conference again took up the matter and appointed a committee to revise the Prussian *Militär-Kirchenbuch*. This revision, which was finished in 1880, has contributed greatly to uniformity in the use of hymns in the church, in the school, and in the home. It has been introduced in the army and navy. In 1880 a committee was appointed to collate and revise the melodies. Their work was published in 1890. Another committee was appointed to revise the old pericopes and to supplement them by a second series of Epistles and Gospels. Its work was finished and approved in 1896. In 1880 the conference took up the discussion of Luther's smaller catechism which was then used in sixty different versions, and in 1884 there appeared a revision that quickly supplanted earlier imperfect editions.

Unification of the National Churches.

The work of the conference has proved that the need of a closer connection between the German State churches is steadily growing, and that this need may be met without interfering with the independence of the individual State churches, either in confession and order of worship, or in constitution and government. A permanent commission of six members was appointed in 1900, with the president of the conference as chairman, to further a uniform development in the different State churches. The commission, which was increased to fifteen members in 1903, is empowered to communicate directly with the church authorities and to report its communications to the conference. It will depend upon further developments whether this conference offers the proper basis for the effective unification of the German State churches. The Eisenach Conference must either be entrusted with greater authority by the church governments, or it must make way for some new body to be agreed upon by the state rulers and empowered with sufficient initiative and executive power for the fulfilment of its duties.

(H. VON DER GOLTZ†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The organ is the *Allgemeines Kirchenblatt für das evangelische Deutschland*, Stuttgart, 1852 sqq. For statistical material consult: P. Pieper, *Kirchliche Statistik Deutschlands*, Tübingen, 1899; J. Schneider, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch, 1907*, Gütersloh, 1907.

EISENMENGER, aiz'en-meng'er, **JOHANN ANDREAS:** German Orientalist; b. at Mannheim 1654; d. at Heidelberg Dec. 20, 1704. He studied at the *Collegium sapientiæ* at Heidelberg, where his knowledge of Hebrew attracted the attention of Prince Karl Ludwig, who granted him a traveling stipend enabling him to visit England and Holland. The conversion of three Christians to Judaism while he was at Amsterdam made him decide to collect all available anti-Jewish data for a work which should prove a warning to Christians, and at the same time shame the Jews. Returning from

his travels he continued his studies for nineteen years, first at Heidelberg and later at Frankfort-on-the-Main, availing himself of the services of Jews who little suspected the purpose for which they were engaged as his tutors. In 1700 he published his *Entdecktes Judenthum*, styling it "a truthful and authentic account of the horrible manner in which the obdurate Jews blaspheme and dishonor the most Holy Trinity, God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; insult the holy mother of Christ, the New Testament, the Evangelists and Apostles; mockingly traduce the Christian Religion, and disdain and curse all Christianity to the utmost: where also are shown many other things and great errors of Jewish religion and theology hitherto either not at all or only partially known to the Christians, as well as numerous ridiculous and merry fables and follies." Prince Johann Wilhelm approved of Eisenmenger's book, and appointed him professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg, but at the request of the Jews the imperial government confiscated the work, lest its publication cause disturbances. Eisenmenger found that he might be able to publish his book in Holland. The Jews offered him 12,000 florins for the edition of 2,000 copies, but he asked 30,000, and died while negotiations were still in progress. His heirs appealed to Frederick I. of Prussia, who carried their cause before the emperors Leopold and Joseph, but without success. At length Frederick I. (1711) decided to have the work published "outside the kingdom," ostensibly in Königsberg but in reality in Berlin, and presented half the edition to Eisenmenger's heirs. Forty years later the Frankfort edition appeared. The *Entdecktes Judenthum* did not meet with the success which its author had hoped since it could no more be called a faithful representation of Judaism than an indiscriminate collection of everything superstitious and repulsive within Christian literature could be termed characteristic of Christianity. During recent decades August Rohling and others have used the work in anti-Semitic propaganda, and a reprint of the portions most available for that purpose has been made by F. X. Schieferl (Dresden, 1893). Eisenmenger collaborated with Johann Leusden in the preparation of an edition of the unpointed Hebrew text of the Old Testament (Amsterdam, 1694), and also wrote a *Lexicum Orientale Harmonicum*, which is still unpublished. (G. Dalman.)

Bibliography: J. J. Schudt, *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten*, i. 426–438, iii. 1–8, iv. 286–287, Frankfort, 1714; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, x. 273, 276, 281, Leipsic, 1897; *KL*, iv. 343–346; *JE*, v. 80–82.

EKKEHARD, ek'ke-hārt, **OF AURA** (*Ekkehardus Uraugensis*): Frankish Benedictine abbot of Aura (near Kissingen, 30 m. n.n.e. of Würzburg); b. in the eleventh century; d. Feb. 25 of some year after 1125. He was apparently a monk of the Bamberg monastery of Michelsberg, and in 1113 received benediction as abbot of Aura, which had been founded according to the rule of Hirschau, from Otto of Bamberg, who later became the apostle of the Pomeranians. He had previously lived in the monastery of Corvey, had visited Jerusalem as a pilgrim in 1101, and had attended the Lateran Council of April, 1102. He accompanied Otto of Bamberg on his visit to the pope in 1106, and was present at the Council of Guastalla. He apparently left his monastery in 1116, and attended the Lateran Council held in March. Ekkehard was the author of a universal chronicle, which he afterward revised four times. The original work extends to 1099, and is based on a similar work which originated in Würzburg, although he amplified it from other authors, such as Einhard, Widukind, Liutprand, and Richer, as well as from oral tradition and his own knowledge. He subsequently extended it to 1106, when he revised it twice, the last time on the basis of the chronicle of Sigibert of Gembloux, and carried it successively to 1114 and 1125. His work, which is not a mere compilation, is the most complete of all the medieval chronicles, although he is surpassed in depth and insight by Otto of Freising. (Wilhelm Altmann.)

Bibliography: Ekkehard's *Chronicon* and *Hierosolimita*, ed. G. Waitz, are in *MGH*, vi (1844), 1–267. An excellent list of literature is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 400–401, cf. Wattenbach, *DGQ*, ii (1894), 189–198. Consult N. Reininger, in *Archiv des historischen Vereins von Unterfranken und Aschaffenburg*, xvi. 1–96, Würzburg, 1862; G. Buchholz, *Ekkehard von Aura*, Leipsic, 1888; J. Tessier, in *Revue historique*, xlvii (1891), 267–277.

EKKEHARD OF SAINT GALL. See Saint Gall, Monastery of.

ELAGABALUS, el''a-gab'a-lus (**Varius Avitus Bassianus**): Roman emperor; b. at Emesa, Syria, c. 201; killed by the pretorians in Rome, 222. He was a son of the senator Varius Marcellus and Julia Soæmias, and a grandson of Julia Mæsa (see Alexander Severus). Both mother and grandmother had retired to Emesa, and here they inculcated in the boy that Oriental religious fanaticism which was later to be the chief characteristic of the emperor. He was early consecrated as a priest of the sun-god at Emesa and later appropriated his name (Elagabalus = Syriac *El gabal*, "mountain [?] god"; by popular Greek etymologizing the name became Heliogabalus, from *helios*, "sun"). The intrigues of his mother and the fall of Macrinus brought him to the throne in 218. His personal beauty impressed the soldiers, and his claim to be the son of Caracalla won their respect. He did not enter Rome till 219. Unnerved by indulgence of his passions and crazed by his practise of superstitious sorcery, he had now only two aims in life, to follow his own pleasure and to introduce into Rome the worship of the sun-god as the one supreme deity ruling throughout the whole world. All the attributes of other gods, even the *sacra* of the city, in so far as these were not profaned and put aside, were to be transferred to this one god.

This was the dream of a crazy boy in the year 219. Ninety years later the Church had to take account of a religious speculation essentially related to the views of this dissipated youth: viz. the idea of the oneness of God, as held by the emperor Alexander Severus (q.v.), and as represented in Neoplatonism (q.v.). At first Christianity was inclined to be peaceable toward this Neoplatonic speculation; but at the beginning of the fourth century it assumed an aggressive attitude and called

its adherents out for the conflict, until Constantine (q.v.) and his followers adopted a religious policy of which, it must be admitted, the boy Elagabalus was the forerunner. As Elagabalus did not have time to carry out his plans, his reign was one of peace for the Church. (ADOLF HARNACK.)

BIBLIOGRGPHY: The sources are: Dion Cassius, "Roman History," lxxvii. 30–41, lxxix.; Herodian, "History of the Kings," v. 4–23; Lampridius, *Elagabalus;* Aurelius Victor, *De Cæsaribus*, xxiii.; idem, *Epitome*, xxiii. Modern accounts are: W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii. 6–7, London, 1890; V Duruy, *History of Rome*, VII. 1, pp. 102–118, Boston, 1890; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, i. 141–148; *KL*, v. 1748–50.

ELAH, ī'lā: Fourth king of Israel, son and successor of Baasha. According to the sources in I Kings xvi. 6–14 (cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, VIII. xii. 4) he reigned parts of two years, and his dates according to the old chronology are 930–929, according to Duncker 901–900, according to Hommel 886–885, according to Kamphausen 891–890, and according to Mahler 889–888. He was assassinated while intoxicated by Zimri, one of his generals, who usurped the throne.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature given under AHAB.

ELAM, ī'lam: The name of a country known to the Assyrians as Elamtu (the "t" being a feminine termination), called in Greek Elymais, though part of its territory was known as Susiana in later times. Herodotus calls the country Kissia. The Assyrian name is usually explained as meaning "highland," but Jensen's explanation as "eastland" (that is, east of Babylonia), may be correct.

Geographically the ancient Elam may be defined as lying east of the Tigris and north of the Persian Gulf and comprising not only the lowlands of the modern Khuzistan, but also the mountainous chains surrounding them on the north and east. Elam is classed in the Old Testament among the sons of Shem (Gen. x. 22; I Chron. i. 17) and this led early investigators to enumerate the Elamites among the Semitic peoples. The classification in the Old Testament must now be considered as geographical rather than ethnological, for it is quite clear that the Elamites are not Semitic either linguistically or ethnologically. Their language is agglutinative in character, and though difficult to classify with certainty is not in any way to be identified with the Semitic group.

The origin of the Elamite stock is veiled in obscurity. The true Elamites occupied the more mountainous parts of the country, while the lower levels near Babylonia even in very early times had a Semitic intermixture, whose nomenclature appears in certain place names near the river Tigris. The earliest mention of Elam known appears in an inscription of the Babylonian King Alusharshid (see BABYLONIA, VI, 2, § 5) about 3800 B.C., who declares that he had conquered Elam and Bara'se. The capital of Elam, Susa, was henceforward accounted by the Babylonians as in their sphere of influence. It had to be reconquered from time to time. Gudea (see BABYLONIA, VI., 3, § 3) conquered Anshan, henceforth regarded as the southern division of Elam, and furnishing the title of its greatest kings in later centuries. Later Babylonian princes built temples in Susa, made marriage alliances with its princes and gave other evidences of their influence upon Elam. The ruler of Elam for about seven hundred years is called patesi (see BABYLONIA, VI., 2, § 1, note), and they seem all to have acknowledged Babylonian overlordship. All their inscriptions are written in Semitic Babylonian.

About 2285 B.C. Babylonia was overrun and conquered by Kudur-Nahunte, King of Elam, whose name is Elamitic, not Semitic, and who belongs to the true Elamite stock, whose language appears in numerous inscriptions from this time onward. Thirteen years later Kudur-Mabug (see BABYLONIA, VI, 4, § 1), king of Elam, established his rule over southern Babylonia, and his son Rim-Sin became king of Larsa, the Biblical Ellasar, in Babylonia. To this same line of princes belongs Chedorlaomer (Kudurlagamaru; Gen. xiv. 1). The Elamite ascendency in Babylonia was broken by Hammurabi (= Amraphel of Gen. xiv. 1; see HAMMURABI AND HIS CODE) and from this time onward Elam and Babylonia pursued separate lines of development, though frequently at war with each other. About 640 B.C. Elam was conquered by Asshurbanipal (= Asnapper or Osnappar, Ezra ii. 10), king of Assyria, and its power broken forever. Soon afterward arose the princes of Anshan, who were the forebears of Cyrus the Great (553–529 B.C.) who calls himself king of Anshan, and later king of Persia. He belongs to Indo-Germanic stock and it is therefore probable that Elam had already been overrun by some migration of these people. ROBERT W ROGERS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. K. Loftus, *Chaldæa and Susiana*, London, 1857; F. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 237, Leipsic, 1881; A. H. Sayce, in *Transactions of Leyden Oriental Congress*, 1885; M. Dieulafoy, *L'Acropole de Susa*, Paris, 1890; A. Billerbeck, *Susa*, Freienwald, 1893; *DB*, i. 674–676; *EB*, ii. 1253–54; *JE*, v. 88–89; and the articles ASSYRIA and BABYLONIA, with the works on history cited there.

ELATH, ī'lath **(ELOTH), EZION-GEBER (EZION-GABER):** Elath is the Old-Testament name of a place on the eastern arm of the Red Sea, and in the land of Edom. In the Septuagint it appears as *Ailath, Ailom, Ailam;* in Josephus as *Ilanis, Ailanē, Elathous;* in other Greek writers as *Aeilan, Ailana;* in Pliny as *Aelana.* These variations are explained by the different forms in Hebrew and Aramaic. It is clear that the name is derived from that of a holy tree or grove, and the original form may be found in the El-paran of Gen. xiv. 6 (M.T. *'eyl pa'ran,* "oak [or some other large tree] of Paran"). The form *Elah* is found only in Gen. xxxvi. 41 as the name of a district of which Elath was the center.

The location is clearly given in I Kings ix. 26, and with this Eusebius agrees (*Onomasticon*, ecxxvii. 40), placing it on the Red Sea, in Edom, three days' journey from Paran. It was known to the Arabic writers, but owing to its inaccessibility it was first visited in modern times by E. Rüppell in 1822, later by Laborde, E. Robinson and others; in 1884 the Palestine Exploration Fund sent out Professor Hull and Major Kitchener, and they explored thoroughly the region between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akabah. Their reports describe the situation as follows: The eastern arm of the Red Sea ends

on the northeast in a bay about four miles wide with an irregular beach of sand, mussel shells, and detritus from the neighboring hills. On the east cliffs of porphyritic rock rise to a height of 4,000 feet, on the west are porphyritic rocks, interrupted by strata of sandstone and limestone about 2,500 feet in height. In the northeast is a depression continuing for about twenty miles at a height of about 210 feet above sea level, which is the continuation of the depression in which lies the Dead Sea and is known as the Wadi al-Arabah. The drainage of the rainy season from the hills empties along the west side though much is lost in the sand. By digging, water is easily found (cf. II Kings iii. 16–17), at first brackish, afterward fresh and potable. Nearly the entire region is covered with a growth of thorn-bush. In a bight of the Gulf not far from the east side are heaps of ruins, and a little farther south is a square fort with thick walls and a tower at each corner, which bears the name of (Kalat al-) Akabah, "Fort of the Declivity." The Arabic geographer Idrisi (1154) speaks of the *'Akabet Aila*, in which may be recognized the fuller form of the present name. At the northeastern corner of the bight is a beautiful palm grove containing both date-palms and the African variety. This circumstance has given rise to the conjecture that the name came not from the oak (as the form of the name would suggest) but from the grove of palms. The cultivated area is small, though the ground is not unfruitful. The temperature averages high, especially in summer. The water of the bay is very clear and abounds in fish, and sharks are numerous. Corals are plentiful.

The heaps of ruins mentioned above belong probably to the Aila of the Middle Ages, the Elath of the Old Testament probably was situated on the hills higher up. The Old Testament knows of two places in the region, Elath and Ezion-geber (cf. I Kings ix. 26 and II Chron. viii. 17), the latter probably north of the former. Ezion-geber has been located at Ladyan, about twenty-four miles north of the present coast line, but formerly on the coast when the sea extended farther inland.

Elath and Ezion-geber are brought into connection with the desert wandering of the Hebrews (Deut. ii. 8), and David made the region a part of his realm (II Sam. viii. 14). From Elath and Ezion-geber Solomon sent his ships to Ophir (q.v.; I Kings ix. 26, 28); but after the death of Jehoshaphat they were retaken by the Edomites (II Kings viii. 20), and were for only a short time in the possession of Judah, during the reign of Uzziah (II Kings xiv. 22, xvi. 6). Under the Romans Elath was still an important mercantile place, the station of a legion, and the seat of a bishop. Under the Mohammedans it lost its trade. About 1300, at the time of Abulfeda, it was completely deserted. H. GUTHE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Hull, *Mount Seir, Sinai and Western Palestine*, pp. 71 sqq., London, 1889; idem, *Memoir on the Geology and Geography of Arabia Petræa*, ib., 1889; E. Rüppell, *Reisen in . . dem Peträischen Arabien*, pp. 248 sqq., 385–386, Frankfort, 1829; L. de Laborde, *Voyage de l'Arabie Pétrée*, Paris, 1880; E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, i. 280, Boston, 1856; C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, London, 1888; G. le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, ib. 1890; H. C. Hart, *Fauna and Flora of Sinai, Petra and Wady Arabah*, ib. 1891; F. Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter*, Leipsic, 1893.

ELDAD AND MODAD, BOOK OF. See PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, III, 31.

ELDERS IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. See PRESBYTER.

ELDERS IN ISRAEL: The patriarchal and later officers, whose position was due to their status as heads of families. Till the establishment of the kingdom the Israelites had a tribal organization the characteristic feature of which was that the constituents (families) of the tribe as well as the individuals were fully independent. There was no organized government. The Sheik of a tribe or encampment among the Arabs has no formal authority. He may lead in war, locate the camp In times of peace, and the like; he may advise but can enjoin nothing of importance without consulting the prominent men of the aggregation. As a judge he has moral influence, but no power to carry out a sentence or to inflict punishment. The elders had similar functions, as is indicated in the narrative of the desert-journey in E. They appear not as though instituted in Mosaic times, but as existing ever since there was a "people of Israel" (Ex. iii. 16 sqq., iv. 29). They are also presupposed among other nations (Josh. ix. 11; Num. xxii. 4, 7). They had no special office, but as the most prominent individuals (Ex. xviii. 21) were called to represent the people on special occasions (Ex. xvi. 12; Num. xvi. 25; Josh. vii. 6); their decision had weight (Ex. xvii. 5; Deut. xxxi. 9); and they were leaders in war (Josh. viii. 10). By virtue of this position they mediated between Moses and the people; according to E, Moses often communicated Yahweh's behests first to the elders (Ex. iv. 29; Deut. xxxi. 9); what was commanded to them was also commanded to the people, whose representatives they were by station and birth. Their connection with the family constitution is evident from Ex. xii. 21 sqq.; while the gloss on Deut. i. 15 designates the elders correctly as the family heads of the tribes called also "heads of the people" (Num. xxv. 4).

Before the Settlement in Canaan.

The settlement in the West-Jordan country caused many changes among the tribes, but not in the organization. The tribe was organized early for war; the family-heads remained the persons in authority. The elders of the tribe of Gilead made Jephthah captain (Judges xi. 1 sqq.); by presents David sought to win over the elders of Judah, of the Jerahmeelites, Kenites and others (I Sam. xxx. 26 sqq.); the elders of Israel led in the war against the Philistines and decided to have the ark of the covenant brought to the camp (I Sam. iv. 3). In the name of the people the elders asked a king of Samuel (I Sam. viii.). The word is used always in the plural. When the people settled in a locality the elders became the heads of the local communities (Judges viii. 4 sqq.; I Sam. xi. 3 sqq., xvi. 4). Gradually the heads of the communities took the character of magistrates, and their influence

From the Settlement to the Exile.

lasted till the time of Solomon (I Kings viii. 1, 3). In proportion as the royal power developed, that of the elders declined. The case of Ahab (I Kings xx. 7 sqq.) was an exception. In the administration the elders had no part since the royal officers were the executives (I Kings iv. 1 sqq., xx. 15); but they constituted a part of the nobility. That they retained such influence was due to the fact that the royal government was satisfied with receiving the revenues and did not otherwise interfere with the affairs of the communities.

During the exile, the genealogical register was preserved; the settlement seems to have been by families, and the heads of the families took their places at the head of the settlements and acted for the families and the community (Ezek. xxi. 1 sqq., viii. 1; Jer. xxix. 1). The return from the exile was by families (Ezra ii.; Neh. vii.). At the head of the families stood the chief of the fathers (Ezra i. 5, ii. 68; Neh. vii. 70). The new commonwealth was organized along those lines; the elders of the Jews formed the national government; they directed the building of the temple; with them the Persian governor treated (Ezra v. 3 sqq., vi. 7 sqq.). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the organization consisted of twelve "princes," representatives of the tribes, who dwelt at Jerusalem (Neh. xi. 1), whereas the local government of the country-communities was in the hands of city-elders and judges (Ezra x. 14). The Jerusalem college of *sarim* became afterward the aristocratic senate of the *Gerousia*, first mentioned in the time of Antiochus the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* XII., iii. 3; cf. I Macc. vii. 33). From I Macc. xii. 6, xiv. 20 it is clear that the "Gerousia of the nation" and "the elders of Israel" were identical. The term *synedrion* was first used in Herod's time, it became the common designation (Matt. v. 22; xxvi. 59) alongside of *presbyterion* (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5) and *boule* (Acts v. 21). (I. Benzinger.)

After the Exile.

Bibliography: O. Seesemann, *Die Aeltesten im A. T.*, Leipsic, 1895; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 296–329; Nowack, *Archäologie*, i. 300 sqq., 320 sqq.; J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, vol. ii., New York, 1896; Amram, in *JBL*, 1900; E. Day, *Social Life of the Hebrews*, ib. 1901; A. Büchler, *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem*, Vienna, 1902; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 176 sqq., Eng. transl., II., ii. passim; *DB*, i. 676–677; *EB*, ii. 1906–07, iii. 2717–18; *JE*, v. 92.

ELECT, ELECTION. See Predestination.

ELEUTHERUS, el″iū-thē′rus: Pope, c. 174–189. He is first heard of as deacon to Pope Anicetus (c. 154–169); from his name it is probable that he was a Greek. During his pontificate the Church at Rome was little molested by the government, there being but one martyrdom (that of Apollonius, q.v.). It was much troubled, however, by heresy. Marcionites, Valentinians, and other sectaries formed influential congregations by the side of the true Church, and Eleutherus had to continue the struggle against the Montanists begun by his predecessor, Soter. Gallic Christians about 178 sent him letters on the subject by the hand of Irenæus, then a presbyter of Lyons, whom they commend warmly. Their aim was probably to exhort the pope to be steadfast against Montanism (cf. Salmon in *DCB*, iii. 937–938), and their admonition may have had the more weight as the Churches of Lyons and Vienne were then undergoing severe persecution (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, v. 1–2). The *Liber pontificalis* gives much detailed but worthless information about Eleutherus. It includes the statement that he received a letter from a British king, Lucius by name, "that he might be made a Christian by his mandate," which is generally admitted to be a fabrication of the seventh century, devised to support the claims of the Roman party in England against the British Church (see Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland). Bede knew of the statement and refers to it in three places (*De temporum ratione*, 331; *Hist. eccl.*, i. 4, v. 24), and it was often repeated and much elaborated in later times.

The first mention of the Lucius legend is in the recension of the *Liber pontificalis* known as the *Catalogus Felicianus*, written about 530. It is not in the earlier *Catalogus*, written shortly after 353. Gildas knows nothing of it. The more important of Bede's references (*Hist. eccl.*, i. 4) is as follows: "In the hundred and fifty-sixth year of the incarnation of the Lord, Marcus Antoninus Verus became emperor, the fourteenth from Augustus, with his brother, Aurelius Commodus. In their time, while Eleutherus, a holy man, held the pontificate of the Roman Church, Lucius, king of the Britons, sent to him a letter, asking that he might be made a Christian by his command. And presently he attained his pious request, and the Britons retained the faith which they received, uncorrupted and entire, in peace and tranquillity, until the time of the emperor Diocletian." The *Historia Britonum* (end of the eighth century; see Nennius) reads Eucharistus for Eleutherus and has all the chieftains of Britain baptized with Lucius. The *Liber Landavensis* (twelfth century) names the messengers of Lucius and locates the narrative in Wales. At about the same time William of Malmesbury localizes it at Glastonbury. Geoffrey of Monmouth names the missionaries sent and makes them found three archbishopries and twenty-eight bishoprics. The Welsh triads (of uncertain date) connect the story with Llandaff. A compilation of the time of Edward II. gives a letter from Eleutherus to Lucius. Later Lucius became a benefactor to the Church and the schools, and, being confused with a continental teacher of the same name, was represented as missionary and martyr.

Bibliography: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 22; v. *proemium*, 3–6, 22. *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 4–5, 136, Paris, 1886, cf. pp. cii.–civ.; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche bis zum Pontifikate Leo's I.*, i. 157–159, Bonn, 1881; Harnack, *Litteratur*, II. i. 144–146; Bower, *Popes*, i. 15–17. For the Lucius Legend, W. Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 3–5, Oxford, 1897; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 25–26; L. Duchesne, in *Revue Celtique*, vi (1870), 491–493; *Chronica minora*, ed. T. Mommsen in *MGH*, iii., *Auct. ant.*, xiii (1898), 115–116, 164; Plummer, note to Bede's *Hist. eccl.*, i. 4; H. Zimmer, *Nennius vindicatus*, pp. 141–154, Berlin, 1893.

ELEVATION OF THE HOST. See Mass.

ELI: A (high) priest at Shiloh near the close of the period of the Judges, among whom he is also reckoned. Descent from Aaron is claimed for him through Ithamar (I Sam. ii. 27 sqq.; I Chron. xxiv. 6). It was Eli who promised the granting of her petition to the praying Hannah (I Sam. i. 9, 13 sqq.), to whom she afterward entrusted Samuel, the object of that petition (verse 25 sqq.), to become his minister in his old age and then his successor. Eli seems to have been a mild, gentle bearer of the office, who had the interests of the sanctuary at heart; but he was lax in the discipline of his sons, Hophni and Phinehas, who shamelessly abused their priestly

position (I Sam. ii. 12 sqq.). For this reason a prophet first foretold to Eli God's judgment in the sudden death of his two sons, a curse upon the entire family, the members of which were to die early, after failing in preferment to their hereditary office. Finally Samuel announced to his master the near fulfilment of his doom (I Sam. iii.). In a war with the Philistines, Israel was completely overcome, both sons of Eli were killed and Eli, ninety-eight years of age, fell from his seat and died. The narrative relates the fulfilment of the doom on Eli's house during the reign of Solomon.

C. VON ORELLI.

ELIÆ (HELGESEN), PAULUS: Danish humanist; b. at Varberg (on the Cattegat, 40 m. s. of Gothenburg), Holland, then a Danish province, about 1480; d. in 1535 (?). Educated in Skara, Vestergötland, he appears in 1517 as a monk in the Carmelite monastery in Elsinore, and it was probably from the patron saint of the Carmelites—the prophet Elijah—that he chose the name "Paulus Helie" (Heliæ, Eliæ). Imbued with the spirit of humanism, he hailed with joy the appearance of Luther, but when the latter broke completely with the Roman Church, he looked upon him as a dangerous revolutionist. In 1519 Eliæ was appointed lecturer in the Carmelite college at Copenhagen, and also lecturer in theology at the university there. In the beginning of his career he sympathized with King Christian II., who displayed an active interest in the promotion of public schools, but the massacre of Stockholm changed his opinion of this king and he came to regard him as a godless tyrant. When, therefore, the king sent him a Latin pamphlet with a request to translate it, and he found it to be "an evil book, more calculated to teach sin than to improve mankind," he substituted for it Erasmus' writing on the duties of a Christian monarch, which he sent to the king. The result of this act as well as of his subsequent bold sermons in the royal chapel, taking Herod for his text, was that the king became enraged and Eliæ was compelled to flee to Jutland. Here he prepared a Latin pamphlet setting forth his accusations against the king (cf. *Mon. hist. Dan.*, i. 121 sqq.), and this was used later for framing the obligations to be assumed by King Frederick II.

After the flight of Christian II. Eliæ again became lecturer at the university, and for a time he officiated as provincial of the Carmelites as the successor of Anders Christensen. In 1526 he published a Danish translation of Luther's prayer-book, in the preface to which he defends himself against the accusation of having been a pupil of Luther, and he also states his opinion of the German Reformer. During the following years Eliæ proceeded with great zeal against the Reformation, publishing pamphlet upon pamphlet against those who had joined that movement, including several of his former colleagues from the Carmelite college. In 1530 he began an attack upon Hans Tausen and had to leave Copenhagen in consequence; three years later, however, he returned and renewed his attacks, causing Tausen to be branded as a heretic on account of his teachings regarding the Lord's Supper. Having accomplished this, Eliæ went to Roskilde where he published his aforementioned pamphlet on the duties of Christian rulers. During the feud among the nobility he endeavored to mediate between the factions by publishing a "Brief Instruction in Christian Union and Reconciliation," which was partly an adaptation of Erasmus' commentary on Psalm lxxxiii (*De amabili ecclesiæ concordia*). Besides a brief Latin history of the Danish kings, Eliæ wrote a chronicle of the first four kings of the house of Oldenburg, generally called the "*Skibby-Chronicle.*" It is a remarkable attempt in the pragmatic method of historiography, and is filled with bitter one-sided opinions of the opponents of the Roman Church. This work closes in the middle of a sentence (*Dum hæc aguntur* .), from which it would appear that its author lived until the end of 1534 or the beginning of 1535. An unconfirmed report says that Eliæ joined the reform party and became pastor somewhere. Schmitt is of the opinion that he may have fallen victim to violence, but this is highly improbable; it is more likely that he fled to Holland, to the birthplace of his beloved Erasmus.

(F. NIELSEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The "Skibby-Chronicle" and some of the letters of Eliæ were published in H. Roerdam, *Monumenta historiæ Daniæ*, vol. i., Copenhagen, 1873. Consult further: C. Olivarius, *De vita et scriptis Pauli Eliæ*, Copenhagen, 1741; L. Schmitt, *Der Karmeliter Paul Eliæ*, Freiburg, 1893.

ELIAS OF CORTONA. See FRANCIS, SAINT, OF ASSISI, AND THE FRANCISCAN ORDER, I., § 4, III., §§ 1–3.

ELIAS LEVITA (Elijah ben Asher ha-Levi): Rabbi; b. at Neustadt-on-the-Aisch (20 m. n.w. of Nuremberg) 1469; d. at Venice Jan. 28, 1549. His German birth is explicitly declared in the first preface to his Massoret, a statement corroborated by Kimchi and by Sebastian Münster. But Italy became his second home, hence he could state at the end of the *Methurgeman*, that he "wished to return to Italy, the land whence he came, and die in his city of Venice." He taught Hebrew at Padua 1504–09, lost his property there at the sack of that city by the French, removed to Venice, thence to Rome (in 1512), where he was under the protection of Egidio of Viterbo. When Rome was taken by Charles V (1527) a second time he lost his property. He removed to Venice, which became his permanent home, with the exception of a few intervals spent at Isny and in a visit to Germany, 1540–43.

Elias Levita would occupy an honorable place among Hebrew grammarians, even if an extraordinary significance had not been attached to his labor by the historical conditions under which it was accomplished. His work became a factor of that historical advancement by which Christendom returned to the documentary sources of its doctrines. To this new beginning of linguistic and historical studies Elias Levita rendered important services. After Reuchlin under the direction of the physician Jacob Jehiel Loans (L. Geiger, ut inf., pp. 24, 26) had mastered Hebrew, and after Matthias Adrianus, a

converted Jew from Spain, had been the teacher of Pellican (Geiger, p. 43), Levita, through the mediation of Sebastian Münster and Paul Fagius, exercised a much stronger and more lasting influence upon the transference of Hebrew knowledge to the Christians. Still greater than in the department of grammatical and lexical inquiries was the impulse which Elias Levita by his *Massoreth hammassoreth* gave to the text-critical treatment of the Old Testament. He brought his children up in the Jewish faith in spite of his intimate intercourse with Christian scholars; but to the greatest sorrow of one of his daughters her two sons, Eliano and Sol. Romano embraced the Christian faith (Graetz, ix. 335). Elias Levita was a pleasing example of a scholar who knew how to keep free from partizan entanglements the interest in the subject of his inquiry.

His writings are: (a) Text-critical: *Massoreth hammassoreth* (Venice, 1538; German translation by C. G. Meyer with annotations by Semler, Halle, 1772; in Hebrew and English by D. Ginsburg, London, 1867); (b) Grammatical: *Perush al Pethach Debaray* (ascribed to Moses Kimchi [q.v.], Pesaro, 1507); *Biur al Mahalakh shebhile ha-daath* ("Elucidations on Kimchi's grammar *Mahalak*," Pesaro, 1508; the *Mahalakh* with a Latin version by S. Münster, Basel, 1527); *Sepher habbaḥur* (treating of Hebrew grammar, Rome, 1518, revised edition, Isny, 1542; Hebrew and Latin by Münster under the title of *Dikduk*, Basel, 1518; with scholia, 1537, 1542); *Sepher ha-harkabhah* (elucidation of words composed of different forms, Rome, 1519); *Sepher tub-ta'am* (on Hebrew accents, Venice, 1538, also Latinized by Münster); *Nimmukhim* (remarks on D. Kimchi's *Mikhlôl* and printed with it, Venice, 1545). (c) Lexical: *Iishbi* (an explanation of 712 words from Jewish literature, Basel, 1527); *Methurgeman* (a lexicon of Targumic and Talmudic words, Isny, 1541); *Shemoth debharim* (a glossary of Hebrew words, Isny, 1542); *Nimmuḳim* (annotations to D. Kimchi's "Book of Roots," printed together, Venice, 1546); (d) Exegetical: "The Psalms with Kimchi's commentary and corrections by the editor" (Isny, 1542); "The Psalms faithfully translated into Judeo-German;" "the Targum to the Proverbs with Glosses" (Isny, 1541); "The Book of Job in Rimes" (Venice, 1544); (e) Literary: *Sepher habbabhah* (narrative of the wonderful events of prince Buovo d'Antona, a novel), *Shirim*, "Hymns" (Venice, 1545). E. KÖNIG.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. C. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, i. 153–161, iii. 97–102, iv. 182, Hamburg, 1715–33; J. F. Hirt, *Orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek*, vii. 50 sqq., Jena, 1776; J. Fürst, *Bibliotheca judaica*, ii. 239–242, Leipsic, 1849–63; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland*, ib. 1870; J. Levi, *Elia Levita und seine Leistungen als Grammatiker*, Breslau, 1888; Bacher, in *ZDMG*, 1889, 206–272; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. ix. passim, Leipsic, 1891; C. A. Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, passim, New York, 1899; *JE*, viii. 46–49.

ELIAS MINIATIS: Greek bishop; b. at Lixuri (5 m. n. of Argostoli, on the island of Cephalonia) 1669; d. in the Morea 1714. He was educated at Venice, where he was ordained deacon and appointed notary of the metropolis of Philadelphia, whose bishops then resided at Venice. After acting as a teacher in Cephalonia, Zante, Corfu, and Constantinople, and after serving in various diplomatic missions, he was consecrated bishop of Kernike and Kalabryta in the Morea, but held office only three years.

Of his works only two are known, both edited posthumously by his father. The first of these, "Teachings for the High and Holy Quadragesima and Other Sundays and Chief Feasts of the Year," was first published, according to Sathas, in 1727, although it seems actually to have appeared much earlier. The book went through many editions, and in its completest form (the edition of A. Mazarakis, 1849), contains twenty-one sermons for fasts and twenty for Sundays and festivals. In his doctrines Elias was orthodox. He emphasized the freedom of the will and the twofold nature of Christ, while in his concept of the atonement he recognized a sort of satisfaction, which should reconcile the justice and love of God. He also postulated the intercession of the mother of God with Christ the judge. The second work was the "Rock of Offense" (1718), which was a polemic against the Roman Catholic Church, treating in its first book the history of the schism, and in the second the supremacy of the pope, the procession of the Holy Ghost, unleavened bread, and similar topics.

(PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Mazarakis edition of the "Teachings" contains a sketch of the life. Consult also: J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ed. G. C. Harles, xi. 787, Hamburg, 1808; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, i. 481 sqq., Munich, 1864.

ELIGIUS (ELOYSIUS, ELOI), SAINT: Bishop of Noyon (67 m. n.n.e. of Paris), and the patron saint of goldsmiths; b. at Cadillac near Limoges in the early part of the reign of Clotaire II. (584–629); d. at Noyon Nov. 30, 659. He learned the goldsmith's trade under Abbo, the master of the royal mint at Limoges, and held a similar office himself under Dagobert I. (629–639) and Clovis II. (639–657), as is shown by the coins bearing his name. During Dagobert's reign he was probably one of the most influential persons at the court. He was influenced by the religious movement promoted by the Celtic missionary Columban, whom he visited at Luxeuil, and whose rule he introduced into the abbey of Solignac. Soon after Dagobert's death he left the court with his influential friend Audoen, also a disciple of Columban's. Both became bishops—Audoen of Rouen and Eligius of Noyon; they are said to have been consecrated together on May 13, 641. The diocese of Eligius included, besides Noyon, Vermandois, Doornik, Kortrijk, Ghent, and Flanders. The inhabitants, mainly Franks with some Frisians, were still for the most part heathen. According to the *Vita*, Eligius had great success in his missionary work among them; but the only certain fact in his career as bishop is his participation in the Synods of Châlons-sur-Seine (639 and 654). The authenticity of the homilies which have been handed down under his name has been long contested; E. Vacaudard has proved the spuriousness (*Revue des questions historiques*, 1898, pp. 471 sqq.)

(A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita* by Dado or Audœnus is in *MPL*, lxxxvii., Fr. transl. by C. Barthelemy, Paris, 1847, and by Parenty, ib. 1870 (cf. O. Reich, *Ueber Audoens Lebensbeschreibung des . Eligius*, Halle, 1882). The literature is given by Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1283–84, and in Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1893), 114. The life in French has been written by Bonnet, Carpentras, 1855; J. F. Godescard, Rouen, 1863; P. Jouhanneaud, Limoges, 1865; H. Delassus, Paris, 1896; and F. Arbellot, ib. 1897. Consult also C. F. de T. Montalembert, *Les Moines d'occident*, ii. 637, ib. 1860–67; G. F. Maclear, *Apostles of Mediæval Europe*, London, 1888.

ELIJAH.

Prediction of Drought (§ 1).
Contest with Baal-Prophets (§ 2).
Flight from Jezebel (§ 3).
Varied Activities (§ 4).
Character and Miracles (§ 5).

Elijah ("My God is Yahweh") was perhaps the greatest of the prophets of the northern kingdom. He was of Tishbeh in Gilead (I Kings xvii. 1 according to the correct reading; cf. the Septuagint). The narrative concerning him (I Kings xvii.–xix. 21; II Kings i., ii.) is taken from a separate source and contains the tradition of the prophetical companies. It is possible that the last sections belong to another Elisha-source.

The public appearance of Elijah occurred during the reign of Ahab (now placed about 876–854) and Ahaziah (854–853). Ahab suffered himself to be unhappily influenced in his domestic life and in religious matters by his queen Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre, a priest of Astarte and a regicide (Josephus, *Contra Apion*, I. xviii.). Fanatical, scheming, and energetic, she procured the establishment of her native cult in Israel, and had erected in Samaria a grand temple of Baal of Tyre. When heathenish confusion had become dominant in the country and the faithful among the Yahweh-prophets were silenced by persecution, Elijah appeared and announced in the name of Yahweh a long drought, and then suddenly disappeared. He dwelt meanwhile by the brook Cherith (Wadi Kelt near Jericho, or an eastern tributary of the Jordan?), where he "was fed by the ravens"; after the brook dried up he lived at Zarephath (now Sarfend) in the territory of Zidon in the house of a widow. For two years no rain fell. Menander (Josephus, *Ant.* VIII., xiii. 2) knew of an extraordinary drought which lasted one year under the Tyrian king Ithobal (i.e., Ethbaal, father of Jezebel), and this accords well with the Hebrew mode of computing time. The later Jewish tradition, however, differs (Luke iv. 25 and Jas. v. 17), stating that the heaven was shut up three years and six months.

1. Prediction of Drought.

At last Elijah came again before the king, who like his people had been humbled by the famine. He asked of him an ordeal to decide which God should rule the country. The outcome of this ordeal is described in full, I Kings xviii. 20 sqq. The scene of this act was most likely a place on the southeastern height of mount Carmel (now called el Mohraka, "place of fire"). In spite of all their penances and ecstatic dances "the prophets of Baal," whom we may conceive as like the modern dervishes or fakirs, were unable to elicit a sign of life from their god, whereas in answer to the simple prayer of Elijah a fire from heaven consumed the sacrifice, so that the assembled people did homage to the God of Israel. The 450 ministers of the false god received the punishment merited according to the strict principle of theocracy (cf. Ex. xx. 3; Deut. v. 7, xvii. 2–7). Having thus expiated the guilt, Elijah could promise rain and went as forerunner (I Kings xviii. 46) before the royal chariot to show that he was no rebel but was ready to render the smallest service to the king as soon as he obeyed his God.

2. Contest with Baal-Prophets.

Soon, however, Elijah had to escape from the vengeance of Jezebel. This time he went to mount Horeb (I Kings xix.). There he witnessed a grand theophany after the manner of Ex. xxxiii. 20–21, xxxiv. 5 sqq. It is significant that the zealous prophet did not find the presence of God in storm, earthquake, or fire, but in the still small voice. Those were only signs, his innermost nature is grace. In the second place it was important that God should comfort the discouraged prophet, who imagined himself the last, the only one remaining faithful, by the announcement that there were still 7,000 in the country whom God knew. Finally he received three commissions; Hazael was to become king over Syria, Jehu over Israel, and Elisha was to be Elijah's successor in the prophetical office. These three were to carry out God's judgment. But the Elijah-narrative tells only how Elijah called Elisha as his successor, while the anointing of Hazael and Jehu was brought about by Elisha. Some have seen often in this a contradiction between the Elijah- and the Elisha-source. But as the records are only fragmentary, a transference of those acts from Elijah to his disciple may have taken place, especially as it concerned political acts for which the proper time had to be awaited.

3. Flight from Jezebel.

Elijah, whose residence was then in the wilderness of Damascus (I Kings xix. 15), appeared only at intervals in the land of Israel, as avenger of a misdeed of Jezebel and her husband (I Kings xxi.), again as bearer of ill tidings to their son Ahaziah (II Kings i.). Finally II Kings ii. tells of his translation, on which occasion he left his prophet's mantle to his companion Elisha. The Chronicler, who otherwise passes over the stories of Elijah and Elisha, mentions (II Chron. xxi. 12 sqq.) a threatening letter written by Elijah to King Jehoram of Judah, the son-in-law of Jezebel. But Elijah hardly lived to see the rule of this king. It is possible that a disciple of the prophet composed the letter with reference to analogous sayings of Elijah against the king.

4. Varied Activities.

Elijah appears as the most heroic form among the prophets. Each of his brief words is an effective deed. The awful apostasy of his people forced him to appear as an avenger. His elements were fire and storm. But though he was obliged to oppose the seducers, kind traits are not wanting in his history (see I Kings xvii. 20 and II Kings ii. 12). By his faithful zeal for God's law he saved the people and reconciled the rising generation with the fathers (cf. Mal. iv. 6). From the theological point of view, very noticeable is the conscious monotheism contained in his mockery (I Kings xviii. 27) which, however, is not a new trait in him. That Elijah and Elisha took no offense at Israel's calf-worship, as some modern writers assert, can not be inferred from their silence about it. Neither Elijah nor Elisha had any con-

5. Character and Miracles.

nection with the sanctuary at Bethel; they assembled the people at some other place for worship, and the manner in which Elijah on Carmel ignored the royal clergy at Bethel, and on Horeb represents himself as the only one remaining faithful is sufficiently eloquent. The story of Elijah is rich in the miraculous and has on this account often been called legend. It can not be denied that the miraculous is intentionally emphasized and colored by the narrator. It is also possible that, through oral transmission in prophetical circles, the account of the deeds of the great master laid undue stress upon externals. Yet by his extraordinary powers he wrought great changes in the land. The principal miracles which he wrought before the people (the announcement of the drought and the ordeal on Carmel) admit no rationalistic explanation. The person and history of the prophet stand or fall with them. Elijah produced an indelible impression upon his contemporaries and upon posterity. On the basis of Mal. iv. 5 the Jews in the time of Jesus expected his return before the Messiah (Matt. xvii. 10, xi. 14, cf. J. Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ* on Matt. xvii. 10; C. Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Dresden, 1742, ii. 533 sqq.). On the legendary appearances of Elijah in the Talmud cf. J. A. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum*, 12 parts, Dresden, 1892–93, i. 11, ii. 212, 402–404. There also existed apocryphal writings under his name; the oldest, the "Apocalypse of Elijah," is first mentioned by Origen (on Matt. xxvii. 9), and from it according to him the quotation in I Cor. ii. 9 is said to have been taken. Among the Mohammedans Elijah became the hero of many legends; he was blended among them with the heathenish mythical form El-khidr.

Elijah appears as the name of other Israelites, I Chron. viii. 27; Ezra x. 21, 26.

(C. VON ORELLI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the literature on the History of Israel cited under AHAB, consult: T. K. Cheyne, *Hallowing of Criticism*, London, 1888; E. Renan, *History of the People of Israel*, ii. 229–242, ib. 1888; R. Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, ii., Gotha, 1892, Eng. transl., London, 1895; C. H. Cornill, *Prophets of Israel*, Chicago, 1897; H. Gunkel, in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1898, pp. 18–51; idem, *Elias, Jahve und Baal*, Tübingen, 1906 (critical reconstruction); W. Erbt, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Hebräer*, part i., *Elia, Elisa, Jona*, Leipsic, 1907; Clermont-Ganneau, in *Revue archéologique*, xxxii. 388 sqq.; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 35, 267–271, 344, 351–352, 524–525, Eng. transl., II. ii. 156–157, iii. 129 sqq.; Smith, *OTJC*, pp. 236–237; idem, *Prophets*, pp. 76 sqq., 116 sqq.; *DB*, i. 687–692; *EB*, ii. 1270–74; *JE*, v. 121–128 (gives literature on Mohammedan and medieval legend). A homiletical classic is F. W Krummacher, *Elias der Thisbiter*, Elberfeld, 1828 and often, Eng. transl. Cheltenham, 1838 and often.

ELIJAH, APOCALYPSE OF. See PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, II., 12.

ELIOT, JOHN: The Apostle to the North American Indians; b. either at Widford (20 m. n. of London), Hertfordshire, or at Nazing (15 m. n.n.e. of London), Essex, 1604 (baptized Aug. 5); d. at Roxbury, Mass., May 20, 1690. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, taking his degree in 1622; then for some years was usher in the grammar-school of the Rev. Thomas Hooker (q.v.), at Little Baddow, near Chelmsford in Essex. Eliot's connection with this rigid Puritan formed a turning-point in his spiritual history. "When I came to this blessed family," said he, "I then saw, and never before, the power of godliness in its lively vigor and efficacy." He resolved to devote himself to the ministry of the Gospel; and as his non-conformist principles hindered his advancement under Archbishop Laud, he sought America, arriving at Boston Nov. 4, 1631. In Nov., 1632, he was settled as teacher of the Church of Christ in Roxbury and continued in that office until his death,—a period of nearly sixty years. He married in the same year. With his colleague Thomas Weld, and Richard Mather of Dorchester, he prepared for the press a new metrical version of the Psalms, which was the first book printed in the English colonies in America, being issued at Cambridge by Stephen Daye in 1640, and known as *The Bay Psalm Book* (see BAY PSALM BOOK).

Early Life and Emigration to America.

Soon after his settlement in Roxbury, Eliot became deeply interested in the Indians, and at length resolved to preach the Gospel to them. Having prepared himself by two years' study of their language, he preached for the first time to an assembly of Indians at Nonantum, in the present town of Newton, Oct. 28, 1646. He was opposed by the sachems and powwows, or juggling priests, but prosecuted his mission with apostolic energy, until villages of "praying Indians" began to appear in different parts of the colony. In 1660, at Natick, the first Indian church was organized; it existed till the death of the last native pastor in 1716. Eliot tried also to civilize as well as convert the Indians, thinking it "absolutely necessary to carry on civility with religion." In time he came to be regarded by them as their best friend. His influence over them was strong, and he exerted it for their temporal and spiritual good with rare wisdom and sagacity.

Ministry to the Indians.

In 1653 he published a catechism in the Indian language, and by Sept., 1661, the entire New Testament was printed at Cambridge; the whole Bible was completed two years later, and Cotton Mather wrote of it: "Behold, ye Americans, the greatest honor that ever ye were partakers of,—the Bible printed here at our Cambridge; and it is the only Bible that ever was printed in all America, from the very foundation of the world." Seventeen years later, with the help of Rev. John Cotton (q.v.) of Plymouth, Eliot prepared a second edition, which was printed at Cambridge between 1680 and 1685. Both editions are now rare and valuable, and no one is living who understands their language. Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted* and other religious treatises were also translated, and, assisted by his sons, John and Joseph, Eliot prepared *The Indian Grammar Begun, or an Essay to bring the Indian Language into Rules* (1666; ed. P. S. du Ponceau, Boston, 1822). In his last years, when weighed down by bodily infirmities, and unable longer to preach or to visit the Indians, he induced several families to send their negro servants to him once a week, that he might instruct them in the truths of the Gospel. His old

Translations into the Indian Language.

age was adorned with the simplicity and artlessness of a little child, with wonderful humility, and a charity that never failed.

Eliot's work excited much interest in England, and funds for carrying it on were supplied by a "Corporation for the Promoting and Propagating the Gospel among the Indians of New England," instituted by ordinance of parliament in July, 1649, and reestablished after the Restoration by the exertions of Robert Boyle (q.v.). He also had support in the colonies and gave liberally of his own property. In 1674 the number of "praying Indians" was estimated at 3,600; they fought with the English during King Philip's War (1675–76), but received a blow at this time from which they never recovered; after Eliot's death their extinction proceeded rapidly.

Eliot kept his friends in England informed of the progress of his work by letters (cf. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Nov., 1879), and a detailed history of his labors and those of his assistants is given in a series of "Indian tracts," issued between 1624 and 1705. A list of these tracts may be found in the article "Eliot, John," by H. R. Tedder in *DNB*, xvii. 189–194, where Eliot's publications are also enumerated. The more important not already mentioned were *The Christian Commonwealth* (London, 1659), which the authorities in New England found "full of seditious principles and notions"; Eliot recanted and the book was suppressed; *Communion of Churches, or the divine Management of Gospel Churches by the Ordinance of Councils, constituted in order according to the Scriptures* (Cambridge, 1665) the first book privately printed in America; *The Harmony of the Gospels* (Boston, 1678).

Other Publications.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A number of the publications of Eliot have been republished in the *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Boston, 1792, sqq. The most complete life is by Convers Francis in Sparks's *Library of American Biography*, vol. v., Boston, 1836; there are later sketches by H. A. S. Dearborn, Roxbury, 1850, J. S. Stevens, Cheshunt, 1874, R. B. Caverly, Boston, 1882. Consult also G. Fritschel, *Geschichte der christlichen Mission unter den Indianern Nord Amerikas*, Nuremberg, 1870; J. Winsor's *Memorial History of Boston*, vol. i., Boston, 1880; W. Eames, *Bibliographic Notes on Eliot's Indian Bible and on his other Translations and Works in the Indian Language of Massachusetts*, Washington, 1890.

ELIPANDUS: Bishop of Toledo. See ADOPTIONISM, § 2.

ELISHA.

His Call, Length of His Activity (§ 1).
His Character Compared with Elijah's (§ 2).
His Patriotism (§ 3).
His Miracles and Prophecy (§ 4).

Elisha ("My God is Salvation") was a prophet of the Northern Kingdom, and successor of Elijah. According to I Kings xix. 16, 19, he was born at Abelmeholah and was the son of a wealthy landowner. He was called by Elijah from the plow to the prophetical work, and willingly left his home, requesting only to be allowed to take leave of his family. He then followed his master, whom he accompanied some time as an attendant (II Kings iii. 11), whose faithful and active disciple he proved himself until the latter's death. Thereafter he was the leader of the companies of prophets and was universally acknowledged as heir of the dignity of Elijah. His activity lasted for more than half a century; for according to II Kings ii.–ix., xiii. he was active from the beginning of the reign of Jehoram to the beginning of that of Joash of Israel (895–840 or 855–798). The stories of Elisha's work are largely involved in the history of King Jehoram, and this period seems to have been the palmy days of his activity. But even if his labors began in the first year of that king, not all of his deeds recorded up to II Kings viii. 6 find room in that reign. Moreover, that Elisha was inactive during the twenty-eight years of Jehu's reign and the seventeen years of that of Jehoahaz is precluded by II Kings xiii. 14. The time of some events, however, can not be fixed with certainty.

1. His Call, Length of His Activity.

The powerful championship of Elijah had effected a great change in the disposition of the people; the God whom he worshiped became again generally honored. True, Jezebel was still alive and had surrounded herself with priests of Baal, and the companions of Jehoram, the so-called Yahweh-prophets, were still less filled with God's spirit. But Jehoram had forbidden the worship of Baal (iii. 2) and treated Elisha with respect (II Kings iv. 13). Thus the prophet could await the issue till he became certain that the execution of the divine judgment on Ahab's house enjoined on him by his master could be accomplished. That done, Elisha's relation to Jehu, the avenger appointed by him, and to his son and grandson, could be more friendly (II Kings xiii. 14). In some places the soil had become fit for the divine gifts of grace, and Elisha, in keeping with his name, could appear as a mediator of divine salvation and blessing. Severity was indeed one trait of his character (cf. II Kings ii. 23, v. 26, ix. 2 sqq.). But as compared with the militant Elijah, Elisha had the more peaceful mission as mediator to the faithful in Israel to bring to them the assistance and blessing of their God. This difference between the activities of Elijah and Elisha depended in part upon the changed attitude of the people and also upon the personalities of the two men. Elisha dwelt more among the people and was more intimate with them than was Elijah. Though he sometimes lived in the solitude of Carmel, he was often in the colonies of the young prophets near Jericho and by the Jordan, at Gilgal and Bethel, and even had a permanent residence in Samaria.

2. His Character Compared with Elijah's.

He appeared as a philanthropist, a benefactor of the poor, a helper in distress, manifesting a tender solicitude for even the little needs of domestic life. As a healer of the sick, so the story goes, he became known even in Syria, and the Syrian captain Naaman, suffering from leprosy, came to Israel where he was healed by the prophet. The punishment of Gehazi, servant of Elisha, represents the penalty due to covetousness, and belongs with the last-named episode.

Elisha was not only a private benefactor, he was also the good genius of the country, so that even King Jehoram when in distress was not deprived of his help, though he was unworthy of it. Having been successful, through Elisha's assistance, in a campaign against the Moabites (II Kings iii. 11 sqq.), when distress was caused by the Syrians he relied on the advice of the prophet. So accurately did Elisha inform him of the plans of the Syrians that their king imagined the existence of traitors in his own camp. The Syrian attempt made to capture the prophet was a failure, and resulted only in the capture of the Syrian force, which, by the humanity of the prophet, was spared the fate of prisoners of war (II Kings vi. 8 sqq.). Elisha's power was so manifest that Jehoram attempted to make him responsible for the horrors of a Syrian siege of Samaria (II Kings vi. 24 sqq., vii.). Because of the king's contumacy, involving also the people in divine punishment, Elisha was the channel of the announcement of the coming chastisement of the royal house and of the people. With sorrow Elisha announced to Hazael his elevation to the throne of Syria (II Kings viii. 7 sqq.) and the consequent devastation of the kingdom of Israel.

3. His Patriotism.

Turning his attention to the affairs of his own people, Elisha caused the anointing of the energetic Jehu (q.v.) who, being an unrighteous instrument of righteous vengeance, destroyed the house of Ahab with unholy impetuosity (II Kings ix.–x.). Only by a complete misjudging of the dependence of the true prophet upon a higher will can Elisha be reproached on account of these acts of obedience to his God. The authority among the people which he enjoyed for decades, the testimony at his death of a king who lamented him as a father and as Israel's protection, and his last utterances against the enemy threatening in the North (I Kings xiii. 14 sqq.) prove how much he had at heart the welfare of his country. Thus Elisha worthily followed the footsteps of his predecessor. He was not his equal in his unique spiritual power, but in him was embodied the lovelier grace and providence of God in the minutiæ of life. The miracles accredited to him resemble on a smaller scale those of Elijah. Whether those miracles, which as in the case of Elijah are recorded with intentional emphasis upon the supernatural, are to be considered historical will depend upon one's attitude to the miraculous in general. The knowledge of future events or of things which are removed from the limited view of ordinary mortals can not be denied the prophet, since it must be conceded in the secular domain to the clairvoyant. It must not be forgotten that a childlike faith, especially that of a man of God, may discern as in a higher light things which take place in the sphere of the ordinary (cf. II Kings ii. 19 sqq., iv. 38 sqq., vi. 6 sqq.). In the case of Elisha it would be impossible to ascribe everything to ordinary earthly happenings. Whoever acknowledges in the life of the Son of God analogous deeds which transcended natural ability will not be able to deny them to his Old-Testament antetype or to credit the story to poetical legend. C. von Orelli.

4. His Miracles and Prophecy.

Bibliography: The activity of Elisha is treated in the works on the history of Israel, for which consult the list under Ahab; cf. also the commentaries on the Books of Kings. Consult further: P. Cassel, *Der Prophet Elisa*, Berlin, 1860; A. Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, London, 1877 (valuable); C. G. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 94–95, ib. 1893; C. H. Cornill, *Prophets of Israel*, Chicago, 1897; R. C. Dodds, *Elisha the Man of God*, Winona, 1904; W. Erbt, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Hebräer*, part i., *Elia, Elisa, Jona*, Leipsic, 1907; Smith, *Prophets*, passim; *DB*, i. 693–696; *EB*, ii. 1275–78; *JE*, v. 136–138.

ELIZABETH, ALBERTINE: Countess-palatine and abbess of Herford; b. at Heidelberg Dec. 26, 1618; d. at Herford (16 m. s.w. of Minden), Westphalia, Feb. 11, 1680. She was a daughter of Frederick V., elector of the Palatinate and king of Bohemia, and Elizabeth Stuart, a daughter of James I. of England. After the overthrow of her father, her earliest youth was spent at Berlin, under the care of her grandmother Juliana, a daughter of William of Orange, who gave her thoughts a lofty and pious direction. In her ninth or tenth year she was sent to The Hague where her parents kept a quiet court surrounded by a select circle of noble and educated men. Here Elizabeth was taught classic and modern languages, art and literature, and showed especial inclinations toward philosophical studies. She early decided to remain unmarried and devote her life to study. The many misfortunes that befell her family may have confirmed her decision. In 1639 she entered into correspondence with Anna Maria von Schürmann, a learned woman, called the Dutch Minerva. A little later she became acquainted with Descartes, who, at her request, was made her teacher in philosophy and morals, and in 1644 he dedicated to her his *Principia*. In 1649 Descartes followed an invitation of Queen Christine of Sweden, but continued in correspondence with Elizabeth until he died in the following year. At this time Elizabeth returned to Heidelberg with her brother Karl Ludwig who was now elector, but his conjugal troubles induced her to leave Heidelberg. During a visit to an aunt at Krossen she became acquainted with Cocceius who later entered into correspondence with her and dedicated to her his exposition of the Song of Songs. Through him she was led to the study of the Bible. In 1667 she became abbess of the institution of Herford where she distinguished herself by faithfulness in the performance of her duties, by her modesty and philanthropy, and especially by her kind hospitality to all who were oppressed for the sake of conscience. In 1670 she received the followers of Jean de Labadie (q.v.), by whose piety she was attracted, and when the congregation left in 1672, retained a small body of like-minded souls under her protection. The Labadists were followed in 1676 by the Quakers. In 1677 Penn himself arrived together with Barclay, and remained three days, holding meetings which made a deep impression upon the countess. Her friendship with Penn lasted until her death in 1680, and he celebrated her memory in the second edition of his book *No Cross, No Crown* (1682), praising her piety and virtue, her simplicity, her care as ruler, her justice, humility and charitable love. Leibnitz visited her in 1678.

(J. Schneider.)

Bibliography: G. E. Guhrauer, in *Historisches Taschenbuch*, ed. F. von Raumer, series 3, vol. iii., Leipsic, 1851; M. Goebel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens* . , vol. ii., §§ 9, 11, Coblenz, 1862 (both of the foregoing contain lists of literature); Foucher de Careil, *Descartes et la princesse palatine*, Paris, 1862; idem, *Descartes, la princesse Elisabeth et la reine Christine*, ib. 1879; C. J. Jeannel, *Descartes et la princesse palatine*, ib. 1869; H. Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik*, pp. 321–341, Leyden, 1879; T. Wille, in *Neuere Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, xi. 108 sqq.; *ADB*, vi. 22 sqq.

ELIZABETH, QUEEN OF ENGLAND, EXCOMMUNICATION OF. See Felton, John.

ELIZABETH OF SCHOENAU: German mystic; b. about 1129; d. at Schönau (6 m. n.e. of Heidelberg) June 18, 1164. When twelve years of age, she entered the monastery at Schönau in Nassau, and in 1152 she began to see visions which are fully described in her three books of *Visiones* (cf. the edition by F. W. E. Roth, Brünn, 1884, and the earlier editions noted in the bibliography). They commenced with a feeling of heavy oppression and with convulsions, ending in unconsciousness. In this state she saw heavenly forms which she was able to describe when she awoke. The visions later became more frequent and lasting, so that she could converse with the celestial apparitions and question them. It was usually either the saint of the day or the Virgin who appeared to her, but the visions seldom transcended the horizon of a simple soul, which remained childlike amid monastic surroundings. Her interests were limited to questions connected with monastic piety, as when she asked Mary for a true description of her assumption, or sought from the angels a confirmation of the authenticity of the relics of the 11,000 virgins which had been found at Cologne. Ecbert's description of her death shows that to the last she remained a childlike, pure, lovely, and humble soul, and despite all visionary eccentricity her religious nature remained in the main simple and healthy. Her own writings were supplemented by Ecbert as seemed best to him. The first book of the *Visiones* and the *Liber viarum Dei* were much read during the Middle Ages. R. Schmid†.

Bibliography: J. Faber Stapulensis, *Liber trium virorum et trium virginum spiritualium*, Paris, 1513 (contains the Visions, reprinted in *Revelationes sanctarum virginum Hildegardis et Elizabethæ*, Cologne, 1628 and in *MPL*, cxcv. Consult: W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik*, i. 37 sqq., Leipsic, 1874.

ELIZABETH, SAINT, SISTERS OF: **1.** A name often given to the nuns of the third order of St. Francis. Their origin is uncertain, but was not due to St. Elizabeth of Thuringia (q.v.). Angelina di Corbara, Countess of Civitella (d. 1435), founded a community of Franciscan tertiaries at Foligno (in Umbria, 20 m. e.s.e. of Perugia) in 1395, which in 1428 became a congregation with several houses, and was confirmed by Pope Eugenius IV. in 1436; that they bore the name of St. Elizabeth, however, can not be confidently asserted. Toward the end of the fifteenth century there was a considerable number of Elizabeth-houses in Italy, Germany, and France, partly subject to the Franciscan Observants, and in part to the diocesan bishops. The latter were given the rule of the third order of St. Francis by Leo X. in 1521, while the former received the revised constitution of the Poor Clares. They wore a gray dress (gray scapulary, five-knotted girdle, and black veil), whence the popular name "gray sisters." There were also "brown sisters"; *sœurs de la taille* (who wore cloaks and gathered alms); "cell-sisters," who went out as nurses; hospital nurses, etc. At the middle of the sixteenth century the order had 4,000 members and 135 convents; in 1900 there were one house in France, one in Belgium, three houses in Bavaria, four in Prussia, and eleven in Austria.

2. Distinct from the above is the St. Elizabeth Society or Gray Sisters of St. Elizabeth, founded at Neisse in Upper Silesia in 1842 by Maria Merkert (d. 1872), with the help of her sister, Mathilde, and two other young women of the Roman Catholic Church. They take simple vows for three years and devote themselves to the work of nursing the sick, helping the poor, caring for children, and the like. Pius IX. in 1871 accorded them the status of a religious society. In 1892 they had about 140 establishments with more than 800 members.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, vii. 301–312; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 504–505, 526, iii. 389 sqq.; Currier, *Religious Orders*, p. 253; R. Bunge, *Deutsche Samariterinnen*, Leipsic, 1883 (with life of Maria Merkert); J. Jungnitz, *Die Kongregationen der grauen Schwestern von der heiligen Elisabeth*, Breslau, 1892; Currier, *Religious Orders*, p. 550.

ELIZABETH, SAINT, OF THURINGIA.

Early Life and Marriage (§ 1).
Subjection to Franciscan Influence (§ 2).
Life of Charity at Marburg (§ 3).
Estimate of Her Character (§ 4).

Saint Elizabeth, landgravine of Thuringia, was born at Pressburg, Hungary, 1207; d. at Marburg Nov. 19, 1231. The leading facts of her brief life are historically established, though a halo of legend early surrounded her. She was the daughter of King Andrew II. of Hungary (1205–35) and his queen, Gertrude, of the house of Meran-Andechs. When not yet four years of age, she was betrothed to Louis, son of Hermann, landgrave of Thuringia (so the common tradition, but cf. Wenck, 221 sqq.), to whom she was married in 1221, certainly not "against her heart's desire," for she devoted herself to her husband with all the love of which a young woman is capable and Louis was a lovable husband. He did not oppose her in her devotional exercises, and even provided for her benevolence which sometimes was very lavish. She became the mother of four children, her youngest daughter being born after the father's death.

1. Early Life and Marriage.

About this time the Franciscans came to Germany, and Jordan of Giano asserts that Rodeger, for a long time Elizabeth's confessor, was a Franciscan; the influence of the Franciscans upon Elizabeth can be clearly perceived. Her later life was dominated by Conrad of Marburg (q.v.), who was admitted to the Wartburg two years before the death of the landgrave, about 1225. He obtained the confidence of the landgrave to a high degree,

and Elizabeth came into complete spiritual dependence on him. In 1227, following his religious sentiment as well as the summons of the emperor, the landgrave took the cross. She accompanied him on the way two days beyond the frontier of his territory, although his mother turned back there, and could hardly be persuaded to return. When she learned of her husband's death (of fever at Otranto, Sept. 11, 1227), her first exclamation was: "now the world is dead to me with all its joys." Her life at this point is obscure. Some claim, following the older notices, that her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, drove her from the Wartburg; others that she voluntarily left the castle. At any rate she spent some time at the castle Pottenstein in Franconia, which belonged to her uncle, the bishop of Bamberg. Afterward she returned to Thuringia with the remains of her husband and was present at their solemn burial in the monastery of Reinhartsbrunn. She wished to enter a monastery or to beg for bread from door to door. But as Conrad rudely refused to sanction this, she vowed to renounce all glory of this world, parents and children, and her own will.

2. Subjection to Franciscan Influence.

Some time afterward she went to Marburg, which had been conceded to her for life with all its privileges and revenues, in order to live there under Conrad's immediate guidance. She joined the Tertiaries of the Franciscans, wore the poorest dress and lived on the scantiest food, spending all her income in works of charity; with great delight she took care of the sick, especially those afflicted with the worst diseases. At Conrad's behest she gave up her children, one after the other, dismissed two of her friends dear to her from early childhood, and took in their place two unlovable servants selected by Conrad, while she so far submitted to him as to receive physical chastisement at his hands. While she was lying in state after her death the people crowded in large numbers about her bier and in the mania for relics, which no feeling of piety could restrain, mutilated the corpse. The news soon spread that miracles took place at her grave and witnesses were examined for the purpose of her canonization, which was accomplished Perugia, May 27, 1235, by Gregory IX. The Teutonic knights, to whom her brother-in-law Conrad had belonged since 1234, promoted her veneration. In 1235 they laid the foundation of the beautiful Elizabeth-church at Marburg which was finished in 1284, where a sumptuous monument became the receptacle of her bones.

3. Life of Charity at Marburg.

Elizabeth belongs to the sweetest female characters of the Middle Ages. With a loving heart, capable as well as desirous of absolute devotion, she early felt the drawing from on high and followed it. Deep and sincere piety filled her life and she is not to be blamed because its manifestation was determined by the tendency of her time. Some extravagance and want of true understanding in the exercise of her benevolence can not be denied, but these defects are intimately connected with her excellencies. That in later years she forgot her duty to be a mother to her children, was indeed an aberration, but she acted in obedience to her spiritual adviser and believed that she was fulfilling her highest duty toward God.

4. Estimate of Her Character.

S. M. Deutsch.

Bibliography: The literature is voluminous; for a long list of sources and treatises cf. Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1284–87. The chief sources are: *Libellus de dictis quattuor ancillarum sanctæ Elizabethæ*, in J. B. Mencken, *Script. rer. Germ.*, ii. 2007–34, Leipsic, 1729; Conrad of Marburg's *Epistola* (*ad Gregorium IX.*), in A. Wyss, *Hessisches Urkundenbuch*, pp. 31–35, Leipsic, 1879, the bull of canonization of Gregory IX., in Wyss, ut sup., pp. 35–53; the *Vita* by Conrad is in Mencken, ut sup., p. 2012; that by Theodore of Apolda is in H. Canisius, *Lectiones antiquæ*, v. 2, 143–227, Ingolstadt, 1694; *Chronica Reinhartsbrunnensis*, in *MGH*, *Script.*, xxx (1896), 515–658. Out of the modern literature, for the most part uncritical, may be mentioned: K. W. Justi, *Elisabeth die Heilige*, Marburg, 1835; C. F. Montalembert, *Histoire de Ste. Elisabeth de Hongrie*, Paris, 1835, Eng. transl., London, 1839 (a picture of a saint, but uncritical); F. X. Wegele, in Sybels *Historische Zeitschrift*, v (1861), 375 sqq.; G. Boerner, in *NA*, xiii (1888), 433–515; C. Wenck, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, lxix (1892), 209–244; idem, *Die Entstehung der Reinhartsbrunner Geschichtsbücher*, Halle, 1878.

ELKESAITES, el'ke-saits: The name of a section of syncretistic Jewish Christianity. They were mentioned by Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xix., xxx., liii.), Origen (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 38) and Hippolytus (*Philosophoumena*, ix. 13 sqq.). The derivation of the name has led to many conjectures. Delitzsch derived it from a hamlet Elkesi, in Galilee. The Church Fathers derived it from the name of a supposititious founder, Elxai, which name, according to Epiphanius, denotes "a hidden power." Elxai is probably not the name of a person, but the name of a book which was the chief authority for this sect. At all events, the sect held in the highest esteem a work which was brought into connection with Elxai. This book, which appears to have been the chief authority for all the Jewish-Christian Gnostic sects, was known to Origen (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 38), and the Syrian Alcibiades of Apamea brought it with him to Rome (about 220 A.D.). As Origen reports, this book was believed to have fallen from heaven; according to an account in the *Philosophoumena*, it was revealed by an angel who was the Son of God. Elxai is said to have received it in the third year of Trajan (101 A.D.), and its contents were communicated to no one except under oath of secrecy. The work itself contains a large element of natural religion mingled with Judaistic and Christian ideas. The pagan element shows itself in particular in ablutions. Remission of sins is proclaimed upon the ground of a new baptism, consisting without doubt of oft-repeated washings, which were also used against sickness, and were made in the name of the Father and the Son. In connection with these ablutions appear seven witnesses—the five elements, and oil and salt—(also bread),—the latter two symbolizing baptism and the Lord's Supper. The same pagan element appears in the use made by the Elkesaites of astronomy and magic; baptismal days were fixed in accordance with the position of the stars. The Jewish element appears in the obligatory character of the law, and in circumcision. They rejected sacrifices, and also

several parts of the Old and the New Testament (of the latter, the Pauline epistles). What their views of Christ were is not certain. On the one hand they described him as an angel; on the other they taught a repeated or continuous incarnation of Christ, although the virgin-birth seems to have been retained. The Lord's Supper was celebrated with bread and salt; the eating of meat was forbidden; marriage was highly esteemed; renunciation of the faith in time of persecution was allowed. A prayer, which is preserved by Epiphanius (xix. 4), is entirely unintelligible. Much as the Clementine Homilies agree with the doctrinal system of the Elxai-book, there are differences which prove that the latter represents the older, the Homilies the later form of the doctrinal system. Ritschl regards the Elkesaites as the antipodes of the Montanists, and asserts as their chief peculiarity the setting forth of a new theory of remission of sins by a new baptism. Gieseler has wrongly identified them with the Ebionites (*Kirchengeschichte*, I. i. 134, 279). The Elkesaites were not a distinct sect, but rather a school scattered among all parties of the Judeo-Christian Church. This syncretistic-gnostic Judaism contributed to the origin of Islam.

(G. Uhlhorn†.)

Bibliography: A. Ritschl, in *ZHT*, 1853, part 4; idem, *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, pp. 234, Bonn, 1857; A. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 433 sqq., Leipsic, 1884; idem, *Judentum und Judenchristentum*, pp. 95 sqq., ib. 1886; *NPNF*, series 2, i. 280, notes; Harnack, *Geschichte*, i. 207–209; idem, *Dogma*, i. 240, 246, 304 sqq., ii. 110, iii. 320, 331; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 352; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 430 sqq.; *DCB*, ii. 95–98; and the literature under Clementina.

ELLER, ELIAS. See Ronsdorf Sect.

ELLICOTT, CHARLES JOHN: Bishop of Gloucester; b. at Whitwell (21 m. e. of Leicester), Rutlandshire, Apr. 25, 1819; d. at Birchington-on-Sea (17 m. n. of Dover), Kent, Oct. 15, 1905. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1841), where he was fellow 1845–48, and was ordered deacon in 1845 and ordained priest in 1846. From 1848 to 1861 he was professor of divinity in King's College, London, and also rector of Pilton, Rutlandshire, until 1858. In 1860 he was appointed Hulsean professor of divinity at Cambridge, but in the following year resigned both professorships on being appointed dean of Exeter. In 1863 he was consecrated bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and on the division of the see in 1897 became bishop of Gloucester, resigning his diocese in 1904. He was Hulsean lecturer at Cambridge in 1858, a member of the royal commission on ritual and the rubrics in 1867, and was chairman of the British New Testament Revision Company 1870–81. He wrote *The History and Obligation of the Sabbath* (Cambridge, 1844); *Treatise on Analytical Statistics* (1851); *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on Galatians* (London, 1854); *Ephesians* (1855); *Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon* (1857); *Thessalonians* (1858); *Pastoral Epistles* (1858); *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Hulsean Lectures for 1859; 1860); *Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament* (1870); *Modern Unbelief, its Principles and Characteristics* (1876); *The Present Dangers of the Church of England* (1878); *The Being of God* (1880); *Are we to modify Fundamental Doctrine?* (Bristol, 1885); *I Corinthians, with a Critical Commentary* (London, 1887); *Spiritual Needs in Country Parishes* (1888); *Christus Comprobator* (1891); *Sacred Study* (2 vols., 1892–94); *Our Reformed Church and its Present Troubles* (1897); *The Revised Version of Holy Scripture* (1901); and *Sermons at Gloucester* (1905). He also edited *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers* (3 vols., London, 1877–82) and *An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers* (5 vols., 1882–84).

ELLINWOOD, FRANK FIELD: Presbyterian; b. at Clinton, N. J., June 20, 1826; d. at Cornwall, Conn., Sept. 30, 1908. He studied at Hamilton College (B.A., 1849) and Auburn and Princeton theological seminaries, being graduated from the latter in 1852. He was ordained in 1853, and held pastorates at Belvedere, N. J., 1853–54, the Central Church, Rochester, N. Y., 1854–65. He was secretary of the Presbyterian Committee of Church Erection 1866–70 and of the Memorial Fund Committee 1870–71. Since 1871 he was corresponding secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions and from 1886 till 1904 was professor of comparative religion in New York University. He wrote *Oriental Religions and Christianity* (New York, 1892) and *Questions and Phases of Modern Missions* (1899).

ELLIOTT, CHARLES: Methodist Episcopal clergyman; b. at Killybegs (14 m. w. of Donegal), County Donegal, Ireland, May 15, 1792; d. at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, Jan. 6, 1869. After having been denied admission to the University of Dublin for refusal to take the prescribed test oath, he pursued advanced studies privately and emigrated to America in 1815. He joined the Ohio Conference in 1818, and during the next twelve years served successively as traveling preacher, superintendent of the mission among the Wyandotte Indians, presiding elder of the Ohio district, and professor of modern languages in Madison College, at Uniontown, Penn. Later he was presiding elder of the Pittsburg district and editor of the *Pittsburg Conference Journal* (1833–36). He also edited the *Western Christian Advocate* (1836–48, and 1852–1856). As editor of the *Central Christian Advocate* of St. Louis, Mo. (1860–64), he strongly supported the cause of the Union. From 1857 to 1860 he was professor of Biblical literature and president of the Iowa Wesleyan University at Mount Pleasant, and again from 1864 to 1867. His principal works were *Delineation of Romanism* (2 vols., New York, 1841; London, 1851); *The Great Secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church* (Cincinnati, 1855); and *South-western Methodism, a History of the M. E. Church in Missouri* (New York, 1868).

Bibliography: J. M. Buckley, *History of Methodism in the United States*, passim, New York, 1897.

ELLIOTT, CHARLOTTE: English hymn-writer; b. at Brighton Mar. 17, 1789; d. there Sept. 22, 1871. She lived with her father at Clapham, a suburb of London, till 1845, then at Torquay till 1857, returning then to Brighton. In 1822 she met César Malan (q.v.), who influenced her strongly.

During the last fifty years of her life she was an invalid. Of her 150 hymns some are still in common use, e.g., "Just as I am without one plea," and "My God, my Father, while I stray." Selections from her poems, with a memoir by her sister, Mrs. Babington, were published in 1873.

Bibliography: S. W Duffield, *English Hymns*, p. 369 et passim, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 328; N. Smith, *Hymns historically Famous*, pp. 159–166, Chicago, 1901 (on "Just as I am").

ELLIOTT, DAVID: American Presbyterian; b. in Sherman's Valley, Perry Co., Penn., Feb. 6, 1787; d. at Allegheny, Penn., Mar. 18, 1874. After his graduation from Dickinson College in 1808 he studied theology for three years and was licensed to preach as a probationer by the presbytery of Carlyle Sept. 26, 1811. He was pastor at Mercersburg, Penn., from Feb. 19, 1812, to Oct. 28, 1829, and at Washington from 1829 to 1836, and was also acting president of Washington College from 1829 to 1832, when he completely reorganized and revived that institution. He declined the appointment as permanent president, but was president of the board of trustees for thirty-three years. From 1836 to 1854 he was professor of theology in the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Penn., and from 1854 till his death professor of polemic, history, and pastoral theology in the same institution, becoming professor emeritus in 1870. He was often a member of the General Assembly, and as moderator of that body in 1837, when the Church was divided, he distinguished himself by the fairness and accuracy of his decisions.

ELLIS, GEORGE EDWARD: Unitarian; b. at Boston Aug. 8, 1814; d. there Dec. 20, 1894. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1833, and the Harvard Divinity School in 1836. He then devoted four years to travel and study in Europe, was ordained in 1840 and was pastor of the Harvard Unitarian Society, Cambridge, Mass., 1840–69. From 1857 to 1863 he was professor of systematic theology in Harvard Divinity School. For several years he was editor of the *Christian Register* and later of *The Christian Examiner*. He wrote *A Half-Century of the Unitarian Controversy, with Particular Reference to its Origin, its Course, and its Prominent Subjects among the Congregationalists of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1857); *Aims and Purposes of the Founders of Massachusetts, and their Treatment of Intruders and Dissenticnts* (1869); *Introduction to the History of the First Church in Boston, 1630–1880* (1882); *The Red Man and the White Man in North America* (1882); *and The Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay* (1888).

ELLIS, WILLIAM: English missionary; b. in London Aug. 29, 1794; d. at Hoddesdon (4 m. s.e. of Hertford), Hertfordshire, June 9, 1872. He was sent by the London Missionary Society to the South Sea islands in 1816 and labored there till 1822, when he removed to Oahu, Hawaiian Islands (q.v.). He assisted the American missionaries in the conversion of the people and reduced the Hawaiian language to a written form. In 1825 the state of his wife's health compelled him to return to England. On the way he spent three months in the United States, lecturing on conditions in Hawaii. He now entered the home-work of the Society, became assistant foreign secretary in 1830 and soon afterward chief foreign secretary, retiring in 1844 on account of ill health. In 1837 he married as his second wife, Miss Sarah Stickney, a lady of some literary fame. In 1853 he was sent to Madagascar to revive the mission there (see Africa, III., Madagascar), but not till his third trip in 1856 was he allowed to enter the capital, and then only for a month. In 1861, after the death of Queen Ranavalona I. he made his fourth, and most satisfactory, visit to the island, not returning to England till 1865. By his tact and zeal he placed Christianity upon a firm basis in the island, and his work was crowned in 1868 by the accession of a Christian queen to the throne.

As a missionary Mr. Ellis was thoroughly practical, being bent upon providing for the temporal, as well as for the spiritual, welfare of his converts. He had been bred a gardener; and the year before he went to the South Sea Islands he learned printing and bookbinding. Thus he was able to introduce many valuable plants and fruits and he set up the first printing-press in the archipelago. Through his books he won for missionaries, as a class, a respect they had not often enjoyed. Writing in the *Quarterly Review* Southey said of his *Polynesian Researches* (2 vols., London, 1829), "A more interesting book we have never perused." His books were not merely faithful records of missionary labor but real contributions to science. Other works that may be mentioned are, *Missionary Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (London, 1826); *History of Madagascar* (2 vols., 1838); *History of the London Missionary Society* (not completed, vol. i., 1844); *Three Visits to Madagascar* (1858); *Madagascar Revisited* (1867); *The Martyr Church of Madagascar* (1870).

Bibliography: J. E. Ellis, *Memoir of Rev. William Ellis*, London, 1873 (by his son); *DNB*, xvii. 296–297.

ELLWOOD, THOMAS: English Quaker, friend of Milton; b. at Crowell (15 m. e.s.e. of Oxford), Oxfordshire, Oct., 1639; d. at Hunger Hill, Amersham (25 m. e.s.e. of Oxford), Buckinghamshire, Mar. 1, 1714. He joined the Quakers in 1659, against his father's will, and subsequently suffered frequent arrest and imprisonment for his religious views. He is remembered chiefly in connection with Milton. For a few months in 1662 he was Latin reader to the blind poet in London; and in 1665 Milton lent him the manuscript of *Paradise Lost*. In returning the work Ellwood remarked, "Thou hast said much of 'Paradise Lost,' but what hast thou to say of 'Paradise Found'?" Upon Milton's own admission *Paradise Regained* was a result of this remark. Ellwood was also a friend of William Penn, George Fox, and other Quaker leaders; and to him we are indebted for much information about the Quakers, as well as about Milton. Of his numerous works may be mentioned, *An Alarm to the Priests* (London, 1660); *Forgery no Christianity* (1674); *The Foundation of Tithes Shaken* (1678); *Sacred History* (2 pts., 1705–09);

and his autobiography, under the title *The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood* (1714; reprinted, Boston, 1877).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. Masson, *Life and Times of John Milton*, 6 vols., London, 1859–80; Maria Webb, *The Penns and the Penningtons of the 17th Century*, ib. 1867; A. C. Bickley, *George Fox and the Early Quakers*, ib. 1884; *DNB*, xvii. 303–305 (contains full list of his works); his autobiography was republished in the original spelling, London, 1906.

ELMER, JOHN. See AYLMER, JOHN.

ELMO, SAINT. See HELPERS IN NEED, THE FOURTEEN.

ELOHIM, el'o-him" (Hebr. *Elohim*): The most common designation for God in the Old Testament, applied both to the heathen gods and to the one true God, whose proper name is Yahweh.

Connected Names. The term most nearly related to *Elohim* as a designation of God, though occurring rarely and only in poetry, is its singular in the form *Eloah*, likewise the short and frequently used word *El*. The question of the derivation and significance of *Elohim* must take into consideration these related words.

For a long time the derivation of *Elohim* received with the most deserved approval was that of Fleischer (in Delitzsch's *Genesis*, Leipsic, 1872, 57–58) from a root *aliha* not current in Hebrew but found in Arabic, signifying "to be amazed, to fear." This derivation does not satisfy because it does not account for the singular form *El*, and the Arabic word is itself probably a secondary formation from the word for God (cf. Dillmann, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Leipsic, 1895, 210).

Etymology. H. Schultz (*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Göttingen, 1896, 405, note 10) derives *El* from *ul* "to be strong." *El* signifies then "the strong," "the mighty," and is conceived as a verbal noun. Many objections can be brought to this derivation both in regard to the significance of the name and with respect to the original shortness of the *e* in *El* (cf. Dillmann, ut sup. Theodor Nöldeke derives *El* from a verbal stem *ul* or *il* signifying "to be in front" (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1880, 760 sqq.). God is then to be thought of as "the leader," "the foremost one." This derivation demands the long *e* in *El* and is not satisfactory to the scholarship of today. Lagarde (*Uebersicht über die Nominalbildung*, Göttingen, 1889, 170; cf. G. Kerber, *Hebräische Eigennamen*, Freiburg, 1897, 83; Bäthgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin, 1889, 272 sqq.) has sought to derive the word from the root *alah* to which the preposition *el*, "to," belongs. El = God would then indicate "the end of all human seeking" and "the object of all human striving." This receives some support from analogous usage in the Assyrian. But the idea is too abstract to express the original first impressions of divinity among any people. The authority of the philologist has very little weight either in the history or philosophy of religion. It is not safe to build historical or philosophical theories concerning the original conception of divinity on etymological speculations. Nevertheless one can not deny that the concept of "might," or "mighty one," has a content which, on the one hand, bears in it the essential mark of the concept of divinity, and, on the other, is sufficiently concrete to serve as a foundation for a root so ancient and original as *El*. If it be possible to remove the objections to the derivation from *alah*, "to be strong," this etymology will be the most probable.

The next question concerns the relationship of *Eloah* and *Elohim* to *El*, and scholars are virtually agreed that *Elohim* is an old plural of *El*, while *Eloah* is a secondary formation from *Elohim*. As to the significance of this plural the main question is, does it now or did it originally signify plurality of divine being? The data are confined to the Old Testament and the text in several instances is not beyond question (cf. Strack's *Genesis*, 68). If one looks at the instances where *Elohim* must be plural, because it signifies a plurality of (heathen) gods, there yet remain a great and preponderating number of passages where it can mean only the (one) God of Israel.

Use in Singular and Plural. In these instances, it is the rule that *Elohim*, where it is subject and where it has an attribute, takes the singular of the predicate as well as of the attribute. But there are not lacking cases in which this rule will not apply in which *Elohim* takes both the attribute and the verbal predicate in the plural. The most apparent explanation is that these are traces of a previous general manner of expression and consequently a proof of an old Israelitic polytheism (Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Leipsic, 1876, 55–56; Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i., Stuttgart, 1884, 376). But this argument is offset by the fact that the Hebrews used this manner of expression in later times where, considering all circumstances, polytheism can not be implied. The Hebrews used many collective nouns and many plural formations which referred to one person, the plural signifying a mass of abstractions collected from single phenomena of like character. If the Hebrew writer wished to indicate his feeling of unity in the plural, he would express it by means of the singular of the attribute or predicate. If exceptions to this rule occur, they are exceptions and not remains of an old rule. The singular of the predicate or attribute along with a plural subject is absolute proof for the monotheistic view, while the plural of the attribute and predicate is not in the same manner a proof for the polytheistic view. A plural subject with a singular predicate or attribute could only be chosen by a decision consciously made to depart from grammatical rules of speech, but if the speaker thought of God as one being, singular attributes and predicates could easily come into usage because it would be understood that the plural subject was really a collective singular.

Extra-Biblical sources afford no help. The analogy of the Phenician which possesses a plural word for a unitary God, is not significant because no Phenician document reaches back to Old-Testament times. There is the possibility that the plural *Elohim* has come in early times from the experience of many divine beings (Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, 445), but this is not more than an abstract possibility. It may be claimed that the experience of many reve-

lations of one being could also give the thought of plurality of divine beings. The latter is probable certainly from the way in which *Adhonim* and *Baalim* are used, referring only to one Lord.

(R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the literature mentioned in the text: H. L. Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, i. 154 sqq., Leipsic, 1885; *DB*, ii. 198–199; *EB*, iii. 3323–25.

ELTZHOLTZ, CARL FREDERICK: Methodist Episcopalian; b. at Brahetrolleborg (35 m. s.e. of Fredericia), Denmark, Oct. 10, 1840. He was graduated at the nautical institute at Svenborg, Denmark, in 1861. In 1867 he became a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and has held charges in Wisconsin, Chicago, Denmark, and California. For six years he was presiding elder among the Norwegians and Danes in the Omaha District, and since 1898 has been editor of *Den Kristelige Talsmand*, a Dano-Norwegian organ of his denomination. He was the founder, in 1878, of the Danish temperance movement. He has written *Livsbilleder af John Wesley* (Chicago, 1903); *Livsbilleder af O. P Petersen* (1903); *My Brother's Keeper* (1908); and *J Wesley's Conversion and Sanctification* (1908).

ELVENICH, PETER JOSEF. See HERMES, GEORG.

ELVIRA, SYNOD OF: A synod held at Iliberris (Elvira) or Municipium Florentinum, the modern Granada, on May 15, shortly before 303 (?) or about 310 (?). It was attended by nineteen bishops and twenty-four presbyters, mostly from southern Spain, Bætica, and Carthago Nova; of the northern dioceses, Legio (Leon) and Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa) were represented, but not Tarragona. It takes rank among the more important provincial synods. Its broad outlook over the whole field of Christian life and attempt to codify the rules for it may have been due to the influence of Hosius of Cordova (q.v.), who was present, although the presidency was held not by him but (presumably on the ground of seniority) by Felix, bishop of Accis (Guadix). The canons, numbering eighty-one, were proclaimed by the bishops. At least at the outset, a systematic treatment seems to have been attempted; canons i.–iv. dealt with idolatry, v.–vi. with homicide, and vii.–x. with unchastity; xi. on prohibited marriages being a supplement to these. All of them breathe a spirit of great strictness, almost of Novatianism. In a large number of cases exclusion from communion is imposed as a penalty, while in others an exactly graduated system of penance is worked out with the allowance of restoration after a number of years varying from one to ten; the synod seems, following the earliest Christian practise, to deny the possibility of restoration after a second fall. Mitigations are contemplated only in case of mortal illness and for women who marry the partner of their guilt; but practise was probably milder than theory. The synod permitted the traditional civil and religious ordinances to stand, but made an earnest effort to guard the Christian flock from any public participation in action contrary to the faith, especially from active or passive assistance at heathen sacrifices, which were still performed in all the larger cities of Spain. The whole attitude points to a time of peace, not to one immediately following a persecution; the complete absence of any provisions as to the case of the lapsed is enough to exclude the modern theory as to the date. The synod can thus not have been held in 305 or 306, but must have taken place either before the Diocletian persecution (in 300, as the oldest investigators and Duchesne say), or several years later, though before 316, in which year Bishop Valerius is known to have been dead. It is probable that it occurred after official toleration of Christianity on an equal footing with other religions had been proclaimed by Constantine in the other parts of the Western empire, or was at least in contemplation—i.e., about 310. The work of the synod suggests the attempt to draw up, under the guidance of a distinguished adviser of the emperor, a sketch of Christian principles applied to the limits of a provincial church, which might serve as a model for the carrying out of a similar program on a larger scale. According to this view, its work is in the main the prelude to a greater and more universal policy, and its aim is more political and moral than purely spiritual. (EDGAR HENNEKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 148–192, Eng. transl., i. 131–138; P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 1–136, Regensburg, 1864; A. W. W, Dale, *The Synod of Elvira*, London, 1882; L. Duchesne, *Le Concile d'Elvire*, in *Mélanges Renier*, pp. 159–174, Paris, 1887; Mansi, *Concilia*, ii. 57–397; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 198 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 180–181; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 803; idem, *Dogma*, ii., iii. 123–124, v. 26.

ELWERT, el'vārt, **EDUARD:** Lutheran theologian; b. at Cannstadt (4 m. n.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Feb. 22, 1805; d. there June 9, 1865. He studied at Maulbronn and Tübingen. In 1830 he became repetent at Tübingen and lectured on the history of Protestant doctrines, publishing at the same time several of his most important essays in theological periodicals. From 1832 to 1836 he was deacon at Nagold. In 1836 he became professor of theology at Zurich where he lectured on church history and the history of dogmas. His delicate health soon compelled him to give up this position and live in retirement as country pastor in Mötzingen. Here he remained twelve years (1838–50) with the exception of two years which he spent as professor of theology at Tübingen (1839–41). He was superintendent of the seminary of Schönthal, 1850–64, teaching New-Testament exegesis, Biblical history, dogmatics, ethics, and church history. In 1865 his health again forced him to resign. Elwert was spiritually related to Schleiermacher, as may be seen especially from his union of a sincere inward piety with a clear perception of the practical conditions of life, from his union of regard for each individual with love of fellow men, and of a thorough classical education with a simple Christian faith. He was saved from Schleiermacher's dualism between faith and knowledge by his faithfulness to the Biblical record, and subjectivism was counterbalanced in him by a firm grasp of the objective revelation of God as an actual fact. Of his literary works, his Zurich dissertation, *De antinomia Johannis Agricolæ* (1836), is a not

unimportant work in the sphere of historical theology. Important in exegesis are his *Annotationes in locum Gal. ii. 1–10* (Schönthaler Programm, 1852) and *Quæstiones et observationes ad philologiam sacram Novi Testamenti pertinentes* (Tübingen, 1860). (ROBERT KÜBEL†.)

ELY: A small town of England in Cambridgeshire (16 m. n.n.e. of Cambridge). It is the seat of an important bishopric, erected in 1107, which for a long time, owing to its remote situation amid the marsh-lands of East England, enjoyed a quasi-palatine authority second only to that of the see of Durham (q.v.). A convent was founded on the Island of Ely in 673 by Etheldreda, queen of Northumbria (see ETHELDREDA, SAINT), who continued abbess till her death. In 1070 Ethelwold, bishop of Winchester, restored the buildings after the ravages of the Danes and filled them with monks instead of nuns. In 1083 Abbot Simeon commenced the conventual church, which Henry VIII. made the cathedral. The present buildings date from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries, affording examples of every period of English Gothic, and especially as restored in the nineteenth century, with the beautiful painting executed as a labor of love by Mr. Gambier Parry, are among the principal attractions of English ecclesiastical architecture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W E. Dickson, *Ely Cathedral*, London, 1897; C. W. Stubbs, *Historical Memorials of Ely Cathedral*, ib. 1897; *Handbook to the Cathedral*, Ely, 1898; *Ely Diocesan Remembrancer*, Cambridge, 1895 sqq.; W. D. Sweeting, *Cathedral Church of Ely*, London, 1901.

EMANATION.

Definition and Distinctions (§ 1).
Hindu, Persian, and Greek Phases (§ 2).
Philonic and Early Christian Doctrine (§ 3).
Dionysian, Scholastic, and Mystic Doctrine (§ 4).

The doctrine of emanation holds that all derived or secondary things proceed or flow from the more primary. It is distinguished from the doctrine of creation by its elimination of a definite will in the first cause, from which all things are made to emanate according to natural laws and without conscious volition. It differs from the theory of formation at the hands of a supreme artizan who finds his matter ready to his hand, in teaching that all things, whether actually or only apparently material, flow from the primal principle. Unlike evolution, again, which includes the entire principle of the world, material and spiritual, in the process of development, emanation holds to the immutability of the first principle as to both quality and quantity, and also in the tendency of the development—evolution implying one which goes from less to more perfect, while emanation involves a series of descending stages. Evolution may be classed under the general head of pantheism; emanation can not, since its primary essence does not enter into the world. The vagueness prevalent in the definition of emanation is due partly to the constant use of metaphors in describing it; indeed the term emanation itself is a metaphor taken from the flowing of liquid. Of these analogies perhaps the best is that taken from light, the beams of which go out continually without any diminution of the original source, and become more feeble the further they get away from it.

1. Definition and Distinctions.

In the Upanishads of the Veda there are not a few passages which point, if obscurely, to this doctrine. One frequently quoted passage asserts that "From this Atman originated space, and from space the wind, and from the wind the fire, and from fire water, and from water the earth, and from the earth plants, and from plants food, and from food the seed of man, and from the seed of man himself." This, however, does not clearly assert an emanation, but merely marks the stages of descent that separate man from the Atman. Attempts have often been made to derive the Gnostic doctrine of emanation from the Avesta, but with doubtful success. Even if we may assume another higher power antecedent to the two hostile powers set forth in this dualistic system and comprising them both, still the independence of these two, as well as of the angels or half-divine beings who surround them, is not clearly asserted as owing to their emanation from the primal principle. In the ancient Egyptian religion, in which polytheism early appeared, there is no question of either emanation or evolution. In Greek philosophy emanations (*aporrhoiai*) occur at an early period, as in Empedocles, who accounts for sensual perceptions as emanations or effluxes proceeding from the objects perceived. Similarly Democritus spoke of effluxes of atoms from the thing perceived, by which images (*eidola*) are produced, which strike our senses. But these views do not come under the general head of emanation, since they do not touch the origin of the atoms. Nor does the teaching of the Hylozoists, like Heraclitus, with his doctrine of the transformation of all things into fire, and then of fire into all other things. The same is true of the Stoics; some of the later ones, like Marcus Aurelius, speak of the soul as an *aporrhoia* of God, but this means a part of God, not an emanation from an undiminished source. The first real mention of the doctrine in Greek or Hellenistic philosophy is in the Wisdom of Solomon, where wisdom is described as "the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence (*aporrhoia*) flowing from the glory of the Almighty." These and the following expressions may, indeed, be poetical, not involving a personification of wisdom apart from the Godhead; but the way in which wisdom is spoken of throughout the book makes for the conception of an independent cosmic power which is an efflux from the Godhead.

2. Hindu, Persian, and Greek Phases.

The doctrine of emanation is a little more explicit in Philo, though he does not teach it clearly and consciously, still less purely and logically. It assumes its most definite form for Greek philosophy in the works of the Neoplatonists—though their speculations are largely derived from the Gnostic mythological systems of Basilides and Valentinus, in which emanation played a prominent part. According to Basilides, a whole series of eons emanated in successive stages from the unbegotten

Father; and the Valentinians spoke of the primal essence as "throwing off" (*proballein*), without diminution, that which was derived from it (see VALENTINUS; BASILIDES).

3. Philonic and Early Christian Doctrine.

In the Neoplatonist system, the highest principle, the One, overflows without a conscious act, merely by a law of its nature, losing nothing of its fulness and this process has no end in time. It goes from more perfect to less perfect, and the ineffable Unity is the source of all plurality. The *Nous* (intellect), the first stage in the process, thinks, and thus from it emanate the soul and the *logos* (word). So the process goes on until the lowest stage is reached in essenceless matter. The notion of emanation was frequently used by the early Christian writers in the attempt to express the relation of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father, though the symbolism is not pressed too far. The phrase used of the Son in Heb. i. 3 reminds of the Book of Wisdom. The idea is similarly used by Athenagoras, Origen, and Arnobius; Tertullian even ventures to employ the Valentinian term *probolē* for the relation of the Son to the Father, while repudiating the separation which Valentinus had taught between his eons. In the final establishment of the Trinitarian doctrine the idea of emanation undoubtedly played a part, as in the emphasis laid upon the Son's being "begotten, not made" (Nicene Creed), and the "procession" of the Holy Ghost; but the idea of descent to imperfection is lacking.

A common misunderstanding regards Dionysius the Areopagite as of importance in the history of the doctrine of emanation. He does teach an efflux from God; but the heavenly hierarchy, with its various grades of perfection, does not arise by an emanation of one from the other; all have their origin directly from God, or the Highest Good.

4. Dionysian, Scholastic, and Mystic Doctrine.

Erigena, referring much of his doctrine to Dionysius, makes use of a kind of creation which resembles the Neoplatonist emanation. His world of *causæ primordiales* is eternal, though not with God's eternity, but eternally created by or proceeding from God. Creation is a *processio* through these to the visible and invisible creatures; it too is eternal; God is in the creation, and the creation in God. From Erigena the custom passed over to scholasticism of considering creation as a sort of emanation; but in the passage of Thomas Aquinas most frequently quoted in this connection (I., qu. xlv., art. 1) the specific character of emanation is so weakened as to be perceptible only in the fact that he does not draw a sharp dividing line between God and his powers and the world. In the mystics, despite their connection with scholasticism, the doctrine of emanation can scarcely be discovered in its pure form. But in the Jewish Cabala (q.v.) the emanationistic origin of the world is distinctly taught; the connection with Christian Gnosticism, with the Neoplatonists, and with Dionysius is evident. With the founders of modern metaphysics, Descartes and Spinoza, emanation plays no prominent part; but the logicians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries make use of the term *causa emanativa* in contradistinction to *causa activa*. In the newer philosophy the old view of emanation is disappearing, though it is found in Leibnitz's conception of the relation between God and single monads; God is the primal unity, the *monas primitiva*, which produces the created and derived monads "*par des fulgurations continuelles de la Divinité de moment à moment.*" But since the time of Leibnitz it has been found impossible to combine the doctrine with the clearer views prevalent on cosmology, to say nothing of theology and metaphysics; and its place has been taken by the doctrine of evolution. (M. HEINZE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature cited under GNOSTICISM, NEOPLATONISM, PHILO, MANDAEANS, and MANICHEANS contains much that is pertinent. On Indian Emanations consult: R. Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, Chicago, 1897; F. Max Müller, *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*, London, 1899. For discussion of the subject in the Occident consult the works on the *History of Philosophy* by J. E. Erdmann, vol. i., London, 1890, and W. Windelband, New York, 1893.

EMBER-DAYS: Days of special fasting and prayer occurring quarterly (Lat. *jejunia quattuor temporum*), on the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, Pentecost, Sept. 14, and Dec. 14. They seem to have been originally instituted for the purpose of asking God's blessing on the several seasons of the year (Bingham, *Origines*, xxi. 2); but later they assumed more importance as the seasons specially appointed for ordination. See FASTING, II.

EMBER, PAULUS: Hungarian Reformed church historian; b. at Debreczen c. 1660; d. at Liszka (on the Bodrog, 50 m. n. of Debreczen) 1710. He studied in the Reformed College of Debreczen and became teacher at Patak (6 m. n.e. of Liszka). After a visit to Franeker and Leyden (1684–86) he returned to Patak as pastor, but was soon driven away by the Jesuits. Thenceforth his life was a wandering one; its happiest and most productive period was a residence at Losonc from 1695 till 1701. He suffered in the war following the revolution of Francis Rákóczy and had to flee from Szatmar, where he was then pastor. A place was made for him in his native town, but the advance of the Austrian army drove him thence in 1705. His works were *Garizim és Ebal* (Kolozsvar, 1702), a defense of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, which provoked a fiery attack from a Lutheran writer, Martinus Regis (Wittenberg, 1708); and *Historia ecclesiæ reformatæ in Hungaria et Transylvania*. The material for this work was collected during his wanderings and it was written at the request of the Prussian court-preacher, E. D. Jablonsky. After Ember's death it was sent to Utrecht and was published there (1728) with alterations and additions by F. A. Lampe, who mentioned the author on the title page only as *vir quidam doctissimus*. It is still a valuable and indispensable work for the history of the Reformation in Hungary. F. BALOGH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: [Michal Rotarides,] *Historia Hungaricæ litterariæ lineamenta*, pp. 49, 55–57, 179, Altona, 1745. Other literature (in Hungarian) is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, v. 336.

EMBOLISMUS ("Thrown in" or "Intercalated"): The name of the prayer following the Lord's Prayer in the mass, *Libera nos, quæsumus, domine, ab omnibus malis*, etc. ("Free us, we beseech thee, O Lord, from all evils," etc.).

EMBURY, PHILIP: The first Methodist preacher in America; b. at Ballygaran near Ruthkeale (16 m. s.w. of Limerick), Ireland, c. Sept. 1, 1728; d. at Camden, Washington Co., N. Y., Aug., 1775. His parents were members of a colony of Palatines who settled in Ireland. He learned the carpenter's trade, was converted under Wesley's preaching in 1752, and began to preach soon afterward. Accompanied by Peter Sweitser, Paul and Barbara Heck, and others, he emigrated to America, landing at New York Aug. 10, 1760. Here he followed his trade and did not begin preaching again till 1766, being moved to do so then by the reproaches of his cousin Barbara Heck. The first services were held in his own house in Burrack Street, now Park Place. In 1768 the meetings were transferred to the famous "rigging loft" in what is now William Street. This was the first Methodist congregation in the United States of which there is record. In 1768, under Embury's direction, the first Methodist church was built on the site of the present John Street church. It was a stone structure forty-two by sixty feet. Embury himself worked on the building as a carpenter, and preached the dedicatory sermon Oct. 30, 1768. After serving the church gratuitously as pastor, trustee, and treasurer, Embury removed to Camden in the spring of 1770, shortly after the arrival in New York of the first missionaries sent out by Wesley. Here he continued to follow his trade during the week and preach every Sunday. At Ashgrove, near Camden, he organized the first Methodist society in what is now the Troy conference. His remains were first interred on a farm near Camden, then at Ashgrove, and finally (1866) in Woodland Cemetery, Cambridge, N. Y., where a monument to him was unveiled by Bishop Simpson in 1873.

Bibliography: N. Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, vol. i., New York, 1832; W B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii. 1–3, ib. 1861; J. M. Buckley, *History of Methodists in the United States*, passim, ib. 1896.

EMERTON, EPHRAIM: Unitarian; b. at Salem, Mass., Feb. 18, 1851. He studied at Harvard (B.A., 1871) and the universities of Berlin and Leipsic (Ph.D., 1877), and became instructor in history and German in Harvard University (1876), instructor in history (1878), and (1882) Winn professor of ecclesiastical history. He has written *Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages* (Boston, 1888); *Mediæval Europe, 814–1300* (1894); and *Desiderius Erasmus* (New York, 1899).

EMIGRANTS AND IMMIGRANTS, MISSION WORK AMONG.—I. In Germany: Both the Evangelical and the Roman Catholic Churches in Germany have established missions whose twofold object is to provide emigrants with the means of spiritual improvement in the harbors of departure and arrival, and to protect them against unscrupulous agents and lodging-house keepers on both sides of the ocean. Aid rendered in European ports takes the form of assistance in making purchases, exchange of money, the care of baggage, etc., as well as the furnishing of cards of recommendation to those in charge of the mission work in the cities to which emigrants are going. Before departure religious services are held, communion being administered to those who desire it. Bibles and works of devotion are distributed. Aid in the form of money loans for the purpose of securing passage is invariably refused. In Hamburg a harbor mission was established some time after 1870, and the work in its present form was organized in 1882. It is carried on under the authority of all the German Lutheran Churches, without regard to the internal divisions within the Evangelical Church in the United States. Bremen has a general mission for all Lutheran emigrants and a minor organization for adherents of the Missouri Synod. There are other missions at Stettin, Antwerp, Rotterdam, and Amsterdam.

Work among Roman Catholic emigrants is carried on by the St. Raphael Society, organized in 1868, through the efforts of Peter Paul Cahensly, a merchant of Limburg on the Lahn, where the society has its headquarters. It has obtained wide influence and has its agents among the Roman Catholic clergy and laity in many American seaports. Its organ is the *St. Raphaels-Blatt*, published at Limburg. It also has an Italian branch the organ of which is *L'Emigranto Italiano*, published at Treviso. (Theodor Schäfer.)

II. In the United States: Provision for the welcome, protection, and guidance of foreigners arriving in the United States, has grown with the growing volume of immigration. At New York, the chief port of entry, more than thirty religious societies and homes are represented at Ellis Island by devoted agents and missionaries who are present on the arrival of every immigrant steamship. The following list of these agencies has been prepared by Dr. Walter Laidlaw, Secretary of the Federation of Churches and Christian Organizations in New York City.

Austrian Society, 170 East Eightieth Street; Bulgarian Society; American Bible Society, Bible House; Clara de Hirsch Home for Immigrant Girls, 375 East Tenth Street; Danish Mission Home, 130 Prospect Avenue, Brooklyn; Danish Church, 195 Ninth Street, Brooklyn; German Baptist Home Mission, Brooklyn; German Society, 13 Broadway; Deutsches Lutherisches Emigranten-Haus, 4 State Street; Greek Society, 8 Oak Street; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, 232 East Broadway; Hungarian Home, 3 State Street; Irish Emigrant Society, 51 Chambers Street; Immigrant Girls' Home (Methodist Episcopal Church), 9 State Street; Lutheran Pilger House, 8 State Street; Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary (Irish immigrant girls), 7 State Street; Norsk Lutherescke Church, 216 Twenty-seventh Street, Brooklyn; Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue; Protestant Episcopal Church Mission, 29 Vesey Street; Polish Society, 117 Broad Street; Reformed Church of North America, Ellis Island; Swedish Missionary, 24 Greenwich Street; St. Raphael Italian Society, 8–10 Charlton Street; Swedish Baptist Home Missionary, 22 Greenwich Street; Scandinavian Immigrant Home, 22 Greenwich Street; Svenska Lutheran Immigration Hemmett, 5 Water Street; St. Raphael Society, Leo House, 6 State Street; Society for Protection of Italian Immigrants, 17 Pearl Street; American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street; United Hebrew Charities, 356 Second Avenue; Women's Christian Temperance Union.

The missionaries and agents of these homes and societies command, altogether, the use of more than twelve foreign tongues or dialects, while interpreters employed by the government supply any lack that may still exist; it is seldom that an incoming alien fails of receiving a welcome to America in his mother tongue. Representatives of Churches and denominational societies soon find their own at Ellis Island, and are ready not only to supply them with literature in their native tongue, but to comfort them in distress, to minister to their immediate needs, to protect them against imposture, to assist them in making necessary appeals to the government, to supply them with financial help, if needed in reaching their ultimate destination, and in many cases to furnish them letters of introduction to friends at the West, whither they are bound. The American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the Women's Temperance Union are generous in their distribution of literature. The New York City Bible Society has a large and special opportunity in connection with immigrants and is improving it with energy. The distribution of literature by this society alone during 1906 at Ellis Island was 44,368 volumes. Of these only 2,713 were in English. The Polish language ranks first in the number of Scriptures called for, with 10,056 volumes, and the next largest number of Scriptures distributed was in Italian, 4,674. The value of these various agencies is warmly appreciated by the Ellis Island authorities, who heartily second their humane endeavors.

At the port of Boston, the same general methods are repeated, though on a somewhat smaller scale. Yet nearly a score of societies, homes and other institutions are engaged in the work at that point. For twenty years the Boston Young Women's Christian Association has maintained what is known as a Travelers' Aid Department, in connection, especially, with provincial and foreign steamships. In the busy season a hundred boats per month are met. In a single year often three thousand travelers, many of them unprotected girls, coming to the States for work have been safeguarded and assisted. The St. Vincent de Paul Society also employs a woman missionary to watch over the Roman Catholic girl immigrants. Not a small part of the Travelers' Aid is that of bringing safely together the incoming immigrant and her American relatives, who perhaps have been carelessly notified, and not seldom wholly uninformed, of her arrival.

At the port of Baltimore, four distinct agencies cooperate for the care and comfort of the immigrant, chief of which is the German Evangelical Immigrant Home. This mission was established more than twenty years ago by the German Evangelical Synod of North America, and within two years has built a fine immigrant home near the landing-pier at Locust Point. It is undenominational, taking care of all good immigrants, welcoming the friendless and finding work for the willing. It provides religious instruction as well, and regularly holds a short service of prayer every morning and evening. For a score of years it has done a most valuable humane work. The Lutheran Mission Synod also employs a missionary, but as yet has no home. The Bohemian Presbyterian Church sends a missionary to meet every incoming steamship and has recently opened a little home of its own. The German Baptist Church supports two lady missionaries who supply much needed help.

At the port of New Orleans, immigrant relief is not yet distinctly organized. The only foreigners arriving direct from Europe are Italians, who are quickly taken in charge by relatives and friends. See Home Missions, § 2; Slavic Missions in the United States. J. B. Clark.

Bibliography: For Germany: A. Schröter, *Die kirchliche Versorgung der Auswanderer*, Gotha, 1890; H. E. Schneider, *Atlantis Germanica*, Leipsic, 1883; P. Müller, *Die lutherische Auswanderermission und ihre Stellung zu den kirchlichen Aufgaben der Zeit*, Hamburg, 1890; T. Schäfer, *Leitfaden der inneren Mission*, pp. 142 sqq., ib. 1894. There is no literature bearing upon work done in the United States.

EMILIANI, GIROLAMO. See Somaschians.

EMILIE JULIANE, COUNTESS OF SCHWARZBURG: Hymn-writer; b. at the Heidecksburg near Rudolstadt (18 m. s. of Weimar), Aug. 19, 1637; d. at Rudolstadt Dec. 3, 1706. Her parents died while she was a child, and her relatives, the Count and Countess of Schwarzburg, brought her up in strict orthodox fashion. In 1665 she was married to her cousin, Count Albert Anton of Schwarzburg. Her husband's former tutor, the learned but pietistic Ahasverus Fritsch, won great influence over her, which appears in the pietistic character of many of her religious songs. Most of these are too subjective and diffuse for congregational use; but a few like "Bis hierher hat mich Gott gebracht" ("Thus far the Lord has led me on") and "Wer weiss, wie nahe mir mein Ende?" ("Who knows how near my end may be?") have found a permanent place in German hymnbooks. Her songs were published at Rudolstadt in various collections from 1683 to 1770. A selection may be found in J. L. Pasig, *Der Gräfin Emilie Juliane von Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt geistliche Lieder* (Halle, 1855), accompanied by a biography.

(Ferdinand Cohrs.)

EMMERAM: An early missionary, said to have been bishop of Poitiers; d. about 715. According to the biography of Aribo (second half of the eighth century), the sole source of information, soon after his consecration as bishop he determined to devote himself to the conversion of the heathen in Pannonia. He appointed his successor at Poitiers, took with him a priest named Vitalis who was a good linguist, and went eastward across the Rhine. Passing through Radaspona (Regensburg), the residence of Theodo, duke of Bavaria, he was told that the country beyond the Enns had been laid waste, and that the newly converted Bavarians needed his care as much as the Avari to whom he had been going. Theodo begged him to remain, either as bishop or as abbot of all the monasteries. He stayed three years, and busied himself in spreading and strengthening Christianity in Bavaria; then he started for Rome, but was murdered on the way, at Helfendorf, three days'

journey from Regensburg, by Lantbert, the duke's son, who accused him of seducing his sister Ota. The curious story is that Ota had confessed her fault to Emmeram, and that he, to shield her, permitted her to cast the blame on him; she was banished to Italy, but Emmeram's innocence was discovered when too late, by the testimony of a priest to whom he had given the true facts before his death. Theodo had his remains brought to Regensburg in solemn state, and interred in the chapel of St. George. There is no evidence for Emmeram's episcopate at Poitiers, nor for his extensive missionary plans. It is probable that he was an itinerant monk who possessed episcopal consecration. He may have worked in Regensburg as the head of a monastic fraternity, out of whose existence the monastery of St. Emmeram grew, and it is not unlikely that Theodo made use of him in his reforming plans. The cause of his murder is an insoluble riddle, since Aribo's story is obviously a romance. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita* by Aribo is in *Analecta Bollandiana*, viii. 211 sqq., cf. pp. 356–357, Paris, 1889 (cf. Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 189); Hauck, *KD*, i. 363.

EMMONS, NATHANAEL: New England Congregationalist; b. at Millington, East Haddam township, Conn., Apr. 20, 1745; d. at Franklin, Mass., Sept. 23, 1840. He was graduated at Yale in 1767, and studied for the ministry under Rev. Nathan Strong of Coventry, Conn., and Dr. John Smalley of Berlin, Conn. In 1769 he was "approbated" as a preacher and on Apr. 21, 1773, was ordained pastor at Franklin, Mass. This position he filled for fifty-four years, resigning May 28, 1827, and replying to the remonstrances of his parishioners that he wished to retire while he still "knew enough to do so." It may be remarked that he retained his faculties to a surprising degree till his death.

Dr. Emmons was a typical New England clergyman of the old school and probably no one exerted a wider influence. His house was a theological seminary. The number of young men whom he trained for the ministry can not be exactly ascertained, but was probably not less than a hundred. Among his pupils nine became presidents or professors of colleges or theological seminaries, fourteen had an important agency in establishing literary and charitable institutions, forty-six are noticed in the biographical dictionaries of eminent men.

Dr. Emmons was an original thinker, and formed his theological system with rare independence of mind. He was one of the fathers of the Massachusetts Missionary Society, and for the first twelve years of its existence was its president. He was one of the original editors of *The Massachusetts Missionary Magazine*. When the masonic fraternity was most popular, he was a pronounced antimason. When antislavery was most generally condemned, he was an active abolitionist. In politics he was an outspoken Federalist.

The theological system of Dr. Emmons is often confounded with that of Dr. Samuel Hopkins (q.v.). The following statement of the two systems was given by Emmons himself, and will explain the difference, as well as the agreement, between the two:

The distinctive tenets of Hopkinsianism are: (1) All real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence; (2) All sin consists in selfishness; (3) There are no promises of regenerating grace made to the doings of the unregenerate; (4) The impotency of sinners with respect to believing in Christ is not natural, but moral; (5) A sinner is required to approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even though it should cast him off forever; (6) God has exerted his power in such a manner as he purposed would be followed by the existence of sin; (7) The introduction of moral evil into the universe is so overruled by God as to promote the general good; (8) Repentance is before faith in Christ; (9) Though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have and are accountable for no sins but personal; (10) Though believers are justified through Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them.

The distinctive tenets of Emmons' system are: (1) Holiness and sin consist in free, voluntary exercises; (2) Men act freely under the divine agency; (3) The least transgression of the divine law deserves eternal punishment; (4) Right and wrong are founded in the nature of things; (5) God exercises mere grace in pardoning or justifying penitent believers through the atonement of Christ, and mere goodness in rewarding them for their good works; (6) Notwithstanding the total depravity of sinners, God has a right to require them to turn from sin to holiness; (7) Preachers of the Gospel ought to exhort sinners to love God, repent of sin, and believe in Christ immediately; (8) Men are active, not passive, in regeneration. Dr. Emmons believed that these eight statements are involved in the system of Dr. Hopkins; that they are *evolved from* that system, rather than *added to* it. Still they characterize Emmonism as it is grafted upon Hopkinsianism.

Dr. Emmons published more than two hundred articles in various periodicals. In 1842 many of his sermons were published in a uniform edition, with memoir by his son-in-law, Rev. Jacob Ide (6 vols., Boston). In 1860–61 a new collected edition of his works appeared (6 vols., Boston), with memoir by E. A. Park. F. H. FOSTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the Memoir by Mr. Ide, W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 693–706, New York, 1859; A. E. Dunning, *Congregationalists in America*, ib. 1894; W. Walker, *Hist. of Congregational Churches*, pp. 280–303 et passim, ib. 1894; L. W. Bacon, *The Congregationalists*, ib. 1904.

EMORY, JOHN: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. in Queen Anne County, Maryland, Apr. 11, 1789; d. in Reisterstown, Md., Dec. 16, 1835. From 1824 to 1835 he was book-agent and editor for the Methodist Church at New York, during which time he paid off all the debts of the book concern. He founded the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, and nearly all of the original articles in the first two volumes are by him. In 1832 he was elected bishop. He was one of the founders of the University of New York, Wesleyan University, and Dickinson College. He was an able controversialist in behalf of his Church, and wrote *Defense of our Fathers* (New York, 1824); *The Episcopal Controversy Reviewed* (New York, 1838).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Life of John Emory*, by his son, Robert Emory, New York, 1841.

EMS, CONGRESS OF.

Papal Nunciature in Munich (§ 1).
The Ems Agreement (Emser Punctation) (§ 2).
Further Complications (§ 3).
The Outcome (§ 4).

The Congress of Ems was a meeting of representatives of the archbishops of Mainz, Treves, Cologne, and Salzburg held at Ems (or Bad Ems, a watering-place of Hesse-Nassau, 5 m. s.e. of

Coblenz) in 1786, prompted by the prevalent desire of the higher clergy in Germany to shake off their depressing dependence on the curia. This desire was stimulated to new life in 1763 by the book of Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim (q.v.), suffragan bishop of Treves, published under the pseudonym of Justinus Febronius, and a tendency to action manifested itself in 1764 in a document of the spiritual electors of Mainz, Treves, and Cologne, in which they besought the imperial protection. Further negotiations followed and in 1770 they addressed new requests to Joseph II. (the so-called "Coblenz Articles"; cf. Stigloher, ut inf. 257–260), aiming at a decided restriction of papal power in German affairs. When, however, the emperor refused to intervene in Rome, the whole matter came to a standstill, only to be taken up again with livelier interest when a plan of establishing a papal nunciature in Munich came out.

From 1771 Elector Karl Theodor united under his rule Bavaria, the Palatinate, and the duchies of Jülich and Berg, which are situated on the Lower Rhine. As these territories were subject in ecclesiastical matters to different bishops, who as estates of the empire were coordinate with the elector, the condition of affairs was disagreeable to him; and as the resultant difficulties could be obviated in no other way, he applied to the Roman curia, which conceded in 1785 the establishment of a permanent nunciature in Munich. The news of this made an extraordinary sensation, because the existing nunciatures in Vienna (since 1581), Cologne (1582), and Luzerne (1586) had proved troublesome because of their interference with episcopal jurisdiction, and because the bishops formerly competent in Bavaria and the Palatinate suffered serious encroachments by the new step. These bishops were: Prince Bishop Count Colloredo of Salzburg; Prince Bishop Baron von Welden of Freising; the Elector of Mainz, Friedrich von Erthal, who at the same time administered the Prince bishopric of Worms; the Elector of Treves, Prince Wenzeslaus of Saxony, who was also Prince Bishop of Augsburg; and finally the Elector of Cologne, Franz of Austria, the brother of the Emperor Joseph II. After unsuccessfully petitioning the curia, the elector of Mainz, with the consent of the other archbishops, handed in a complaint to the emperor as the supreme protector of the Church, and the latter caused a declaration to be made in Rome, that he could not permit that the archbishops and bishops of the German empire should be disturbed in the diocesan rights which had been given to them by God and by the Church; in other words, that he would recognize the papal nuncios merely as delegates for political affairs and matters pertaining to the pope as the supreme head of the Church, but that he could concede to them no jurisdiction whatever. But the curia did not allow itself to be put off by this protest; in May, 1786, there appeared as nuncio in Munich Count Zoglio, Archbishop of Athens; at the same time the nunciature at Cologne was newly filled with Bartholomæus Pacca, archbishop of Damiate, in the place of Monsignor Bellisomi. Zoglio was brilliantly received at the Bavarian Court; Pacca was not even given an audience by the elector of Cologne. All the German archbishops refused to recognize the two nuncios, but nevertheless the latter began at once to make use of their commissions.

1. Papal Nunciature in Munich.

The archbishops of Mainz, Treves, and Cologne did not remain inactive. The Congress of Ems followed, and its result was the "Ems Agreement" (*Emser Punktation*, cf. Mirbt, *Quellen*, 326–328), which was signed on Aug. 25, 1786, and at once ratified by the bishops and sent to Joseph II. The subscribers declared therein:

2. The Ems Agreement (Emser Punctation).

> The Roman Pope is and always remains the supreme overseer (*Oberaufseher*) and primate of the whole Church, the center of unity, and has been equipped by God with the jurisdiction requisite thereto. All Roman Catholics must always yield him canonical obedience with full reverence. But all the other advantages and reservations which were not connected with this primacy in the first centuries, but arose from the later Isidorian Decretals to the manifest detriment of the bishops, can no longer be included in the sphere of this jurisdiction, because the forged nature of the Decretals is now universally recognized. These are to be classed rather as usurpations on the part of the Roman curia, and, especially because none of the remonstrances hitherto made at the Roman curia has been of effect, the bishops are authorized to reinstate themselves, under the supreme protection of his Imperial Majesty, in the exercise of the power committed to them by God.
>
> Then the archbishops made the following propositions for reform: all persons living within the limits of a diocese should henceforward without exception be subject to its bishop. Therefore appeals to Rome which neglect the bishop should no longer be allowed; exemptions, with certain stated exceptions, should cease; the monastic clergy should be forbidden to render obedience to foreign generals and superiors. The bishop should have the right to grant dispensations from commandments of abstinence and from matrimonial impediments, and also to absolve the monastic clergy from their vows. At the same time limitation of the impediments to marriage and postponement of the age for taking vows was proposed. The bishop should also be empowered to modify philanthropic trusts. In future *facultates quinquennales* should no longer be sought of the Roman court. The bulls, briefs, and other papal regulations, as well as the decisions of the Roman congregations, should not have binding force until accepted by the bishops. The nunciatures in the form in which they had hitherto existed should cease. It was further attempted to insure the independence of the bishop in filling ecclesiastical positions. The procedure in regard to the "information" (*processus informativus*) of new bishops should be altered; the oath which the bishop had formerly rendered to the pope as his vassal should be replaced by a formula in accordance with episcopal rights. The annates and the moneys paid on receipt of the pallium should be reduced, and if the pope should therefore refuse his confirmation, the archbishops and bishops should nevertheless perform the functions of office. In spiritual jurisdiction the court of first instance is that of the bishop, the second that of the archbishop, the third is the Roman See, the nunciatures being entirely left out; provision is made, moreover, that national judges should pronounce the verdict even in Rome. At the close, the arohbishops declare that, as soon as they are put in possession of the rights which belonged to them, they will take up the improvement of ecclesiastical discipline, and better organization for the cure of souls and for religious establishments and cloisters. Moreover, the emperor, as the supreme head of the empire, is requested to demand of the curia that the council which had been promised in the Concordat of Aschaffenburg (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, III, 1, § 2) or at least a national council, should be convened.

The answer of the emperor was kindly; he even showed readiness to help; but he advised the arch-

bishops above all to come to an understanding with the bishops under them. This advice was at once adopted, but it was too late. The German bishops felt aggrieved because they had not been admitted to the consultation at Ems, and even though some of them were won over, a part held entirely aloof. This opposition of the bishops found its leader and spokesman in Count Limburg-Styrum, prince bishop of Speyer, who came out in public with his criticism of the resolutions of Ems and thereby started lengthy literary discussions on both sides.

3. Further Complications.

The contest between the archbishops and the nuncios had broken out at the close of 1786. Zoglio had appointed a provost in Düsseldorf, internuncio for Jülich and Berg; and Pacca granted a matrimonial dispensation regardless of an objection made by the elector of Cologne. As the latter, like the electors of Treves and Mainz, granted certain matrimonial dispensations in degrees not covered by their quinquennial faculties, Pacca sent on Nov. 30, 1786, a circular to all priests and general vicariates, declaring the invalidity of these dispensations. Then the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, and Mainz gave all their priests the command to return this circular to the sender. In this they were supported by the emperor. The Imperial Council in Vienna published two decrees in which Pacca's action was designated as unseemly and improper and his circular was formally declared invalid. The elector of the Palatinate was, moreover, directed not to concede any jurisdiction to the nuncio Zoglio, and also to prohibit the internuncio appointed by him from executing the orders given by the nuncio. But the elector of the Palatinate objected strongly to this censure, and demanded of the priests of the diocese of Worms that, under penalty of confiscation of their temporalia, they should at once return the archiepiscopal order which had demanded their sending back the circular of the nuncio. He also required that they should accept no directions from the archiepiscopal vicariate without his consent, and laid claim to the power to receive a nuncio as one of his rights as sovereign and made it known to the emperor that his territorial rights might be limited by imperial legislation but not by decrees of the Imperial Council. Zoglio now appointed, with the encouragement of the elector, a subdelegate in Heidelberg.

Still greater dangers for the German archbishops arose among themselves. In 1785 the German "League of Princes" (*Fürstenbund*) had been formed. Its existence was in danger, if on the death of the aged and invalid archbishop of Mainz, Friedrich von Erthal, his successor did not sustain his policy. Under these circumstances Prussia undertook to play the part of mediator in the contest between the elector of Mainz and the curia, and a secret arrangement was made that Theodor von Dalberg, the candidate preferred by Prussia and agreeable to the cathedral chapter of Mainz, should be recognized by the pope as the successor of the elector. This agreement also stated that both the elector and Dalberg promised to remain true to the union; but both took upon themselves as well the obligation of not putting the resolution of the Congress of Ems into execution. On June 5, 1787, Dalberg was chosen coadjutor archbishop of Mainz. In pursuance of this arrangement he openly abandoned the ground taken in the Ems agreement, petitioned in Rome for the renewal of the quinquennial faculties, and raised no objection when the nuncio in Cologne was commissioned to undertake his episcopal examination (*processus informativus*).

The other bishops also appeared to be more peaceably inclined. Then Pius VI. adopted a measure which provoked great excitement; in a brief of Nov. 6, 1787, he granted the petition of the elector of the Bavarian Palatinate to take a tithe of the incomes of the ecclesiastical property throughout the whole extent of his territories. This concession was all the more important because it was to last ten years and the nuncio in Munich was ordered to collect the tithe and commissioned to punish with all censures, and even with excommunication, those who refused the payment, and, if necessary, to depose them from their offices and benefices. All the German archbishops were affected by this order; Mainz, in the diocese of Worms; Cologne, in the duchies of Jülich and Berg; Treves, in Augsburg; Salzburg, in his Bavarian territories.

This procedure on the part of the curia, to be sure, caused the elector of Mainz to return to the side of the other archbishops, and induced them to approach the emperor again in order to obtain action against the nuncios. With their assent an imperial court decree was issued, which referred to the Diet of Regensburg the controverted question whether nuncios with jurisdiction should be tolerated in Germany. But not even the archbishops earnestly intended to bring about a decision at the diet; they only wished to put pressure on the curia. The negotiations were without issue and finally the archbishops decided to take the advice which had been given them and preferably to reach an understanding with the curia directly; but their efforts in Rome met with no success. The answer which finally came to them, dated Nov. 14, 1789, was in the form of a brief, which was a memorial filling three hundred and thirty-six quarto pages. Therein the pope insisted upon all his demands in their full scope.

4. The Outcome.

The curia had made no mistake in its calculations. Under the pressure of the revolutionary trend of the times, which proceeded from France, the opposition of the German archbishops collapsed. The electors fled from their capitals in 1792 when the French General Custine drew near. The abolition of the ecclesiastical principalities, ordered in 1803, together with the still more potent factor of the rise of Ultramontanism, have saved the nineteenth-century papacy from a resurrection in power of the ideas of 1786.

The defeat of the German archbishops may be explained on many grounds. It was disadvantageous for them that public opinion, which backed them at the start, soon turned from them and became interested in other things; but the lament-

able issue of the controversy was chiefly the result of the character of the opposition movement itself. To be sure, motives of religion and of ecclesiastical reform were not entirely wanting; considerations of German national feeling were not lacking; but primarily the archbishops most heartily desired to benefit their own interests as archbishops and territorial sovereigns—interests in the assertion of which they were hindered by the extension of the papal power. As a result the contest soon took on essentially the character of politics or of church politics. Thereby they lost the support which the sympathy of the Roman Catholic population and clergy might have given them; thereby the harmony of the archbishops themselves suffered. The curia owed its victory to the attitude of the German bishops, who felt themselves threatened by an increase of archiepiscopal power, to the energetic action of the Bavarian Palatinate, and to the emperor's inadequate support of the archbishops; and last, not least, to the commencement of the revolutionary period and to the circumstance that the entire development of post-Reformation Catholicism was on the side of the curia. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Resultat des Emser Kongresses*, Frankfort, 1787; F K. von Moser, *Geschichte der päpstlichen Nuntien in Deutschland*, ib. 1788; *Historische Denkwürdigkeiten des Kardinals . Pacca*, Augsburg, 1832; E. von Münch, *Geschichte des Emser Kongresses*, Carlsruhe, 1840; M. Stigloher, *Die Errichtung der päpstlichen Nuntiatur in München und der Emser Kongress*, Regensburg, 1867; O. Mejer, *Febronius*, Tübingen, 1880; H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, part i., Mainz, 1902.

EMSER, HIERONYMUS: Literary opponent of Luther; b. at Ulm, Mar. 16 (26?), 1478 (1477?); d. at Dresden Nov. 8, 1527. He studied at Tübingen (1493–97) and at Basel, where he received his first and second degrees; in consequence of certain satirical verses, which offended the Swiss, he was driven from the latter city. As secretary and chaplain he accompanied the papal legate, Cardinal Raymund Peraudi, on a tour of visitation in Germany (1502 sqq.), and thus came to know a great part of the land and its famous men. At the request of the cardinal he published (1503) a treatise *De crucibus*, attesting certain alleged miracles in the course of the war against the Turks. In 1504 he edited the works of Pico della Mirandola at Strasburg, taught at Erfurt, where he had Luther among his hearers, and went to Leipsic, where he became bachelor of theology in Jan., 1505. Duke George of Saxony had already chosen him secretary and this post called him to Dresden. For some years he was occupied with the effort to secure canonization for Benno, bishop of Meissen (q.v.), which took him to Rome in 1506–07. He received rich benefices and led a very comfortable life at Dresden and Leipsic. A Latin treatise on the origin of the custom of drinking healths, an uncritical and fantastic life of Benno, an essay on the best way of keeping wine, numerous light verses, and new editions of the works of others belong to this period.

When the Reformation came Emser naturally took sides against Luther, having no true appreciation of the dangers of the Church and sharing in the jealousy which the Saxon court felt toward Wittenberg. He considered Luther a Hussite, a revolutionist, one who, contrary to the Bible, rejected the utterances of traditional authority, sacrificed the "ecclesiastical" priesthood to the "laical," uprooted the papacy, and stirred up the common people against the clergy and rulers. After the Leipsic Disputation (1519) an open rupture took place and a controversy began, by no means edifying and without profit to the cause. It is sufficiently characterized by stating that during its progress Luther called Emser the he-goat of Dresden, with reference to his escutcheon, and Emser called Luther the bull of Wittenberg. After a time Luther gave up the contest, but Emser continued to issue original works and translations or new editions of the works of others against Luther, writing generally in German and often in doggerel verse to catch the ear of the people. He criticized Luther's translation of the New Testament, exhorted the bishops to provide a better, and ultimately undertook the task himself; in Aug., 1527, his work appeared, made to resemble Luther's folio edition as much as possible, with illustrations by Cranach and his scholar, Gottfried Leigel, which had already been used in Luther's "December" Bible of 1522. Introductions and notes are added; but at the end Emser warns the laity against Bible-reading. The work at once became popular, and in its original form and worked over by Johann Dietenberger and by Eck, it appeared in more than one hundred editions during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Luther criticized it sharply as stolen from his text.

Of the earlier literary opponents of the Reformation Emser was the most indefatigable. He published his writings at no small personal expense. He was well read in the fathers and had good humanistic training. But he was uncritically and blindly devoted to tradition, and quite unable to appreciate the motives which influenced Luther. His hatred for the latter steadily increased and he wished more and more earnestly to have him silenced by force. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. E. Waldau, *Nachricht von H. Emser's Leben*, Anspach, 1783; P. Mosen, *H. Emser, der Vorkämpfer Roms gegen die Reformation*, Halle, 1890; G. Kawerau, *Hieronymus Emser*, Halle, 1898. On his New Testament, consult G. W. Panzer, *Versuch einer kurzen Geschichte der römisch-katholischen deutschen Bibelübersetzungen*, pp. 16 sqq., Nuremberg, 1781.

ENCÆNIA (Gk. *enkainia*): A dedication festival; applied particularly to the Jewish festival commemorating the rededication of the Temple (see SYNAGOGUE), and to the anniversaries of church dedications (see CONSECRATION).

ENCRATITES, en'cra-tāits ("the Self-disciplined," "the Continent"): A name given in the Christian heretic-histories to certain sectaries, who abstained from animal food, intoxicating drinks, and sexual intercourse. Strictly speaking there was no sect of Encratites, nor did they have a particular founder, though Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, iv. 28) first mentions Tatian as such. Nor can they be lumped together with the Gnostics, which, however, does not mean that Encratites here and there may not have represented Gnostic teachings.

Hippolytus (*Philosophumena*, viii. 20) says expressly that the views of Encratites about God and Christ accorded with those of the Church. Clement of Alexandria states that Julius Cassianus, whom he calls the founder of the heresy of the Docetæ (see DOCETISM) wrote "about continence or about eunuchism" and quotes three passages from this work of Encratitic content (*Strom.*, iii. 13). Encratitic tendencies were no doubt shown also by the Gospel according to the Egyptians (see APOCRYPHA, B, I., 8). Epiphanius devoted an entire section of his history of heresies (xlvii.) to the Encratites; he speaks of their dualism, says that they reckon the Acts of Andrew, John, Thomas, and other apocrypha among their Scriptures, and that they use water instead of wine at the Lord's Supper (like the Aquarii and Hydroparastatæ, qq.v.). Encratism is not confined to Christianity; Clement (*Strom.*, i. 15) compares them with the Indian gymnosophists, and Hippolytus (*Philosophumena*, viii. 20) with the Cynics. The Nazirite's vow and the usages of the Essenes may also be brought into comparison, although no genetic connection can be shown. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 456–458, 505; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 495; *DCB*, ii. 118–120; and the literature under TERTULLIAN.

ENCYCLICAL LETTERS: Circular letters, which in the ancient Church were often sent by a church or council to the churches of a certain district. The name is now applied to letters of the pope, relating to the entire Church, sent to all his subordinate bishops.

ENCYCLOPEDIA, THEOLOGICAL.

Conception and Purpose (§ 1).
Theological Science in the Primitive Church (§ 2).
In the Byzantine and Middle Ages (§ 3).
In Humanism and the Reformation (§ 4).
Pietism and Rationalism Influential (§ 5).
Schleiermacher and his Influence (§ 6).
Modern Problems (§ 7).
Development Outside Germany (§ 8).
In the Roman Catholic Church (§ 9).

Theological Encyclopedia is the branch of learning which sets forth the order and contents of theological science. The word *encyclopedia*, in its technical sense, is derived from the philosophic realm of Alexandrine study, and back of that from Greek antiquity. Since the time of Aristotle *enkyklios paideia* meant the circle of education which, according to Quintilian (*Institutiones*, I., x. 101), included grammar, rhetoric, music, geometry, and astronomy. The idea which philosophy took up was appropriated by theology. The compounded expression as a single word occurs first in a discourse by the Jesuit Tarquin Gallucci (b. 1574) entitled *De encyclopœdia comparanda* (J. Lami, *De eruditione apostolorum*, Florence, 1738, p. 215) and next in J. H. Alstedt's *Cursus philosophici encyclopœdia* (Herborn, 1620), in which Alstedt refers to the *Encyclopœdia* of Matthias Martin (1649) as his source. The meaning of "Encyclopedia" in these cases is an orderly exposition of knowledge. The works just named were the forerunners of the great encyclopedic collections which have set forth either the material of science as a whole or that of individual sciences. So that the word encyclopedia has become fully naturalized. It was first applied to theology by S. Mursinna in *Primæ lineæ encyclopœdiæ theologicæ* (Halle, 1764–94). The idea of a formal encyclopedia of sciences was first put forward by Hegel (*Encyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, Heidelberg, 1827, § 16), who limited it to the setting forth of the beginnings and the fundamental conceptions of special sciences. So theological encyclopedia sets forth the fundamental conceptions and methods of theological science. In doing this it takes cognizance of the genius of the Christian religion, of the causes which have built up a theology, of the historical and systematic relationship of the parts to the whole, and, above all, of the relationship of the science to life and of theology as the science of religion to the Church which is held together by this religion. Inasmuch as this science is always in a state of flux—new materials always being added, new questions arising—the best that can be done is to describe it historically and in relation to the present.

1. Conception and Purpose.

The history of theological encyclopedia is not to be separated from the history of teaching and of the science. Christian theology grew out of the proclamation of the Gospel according to the command of Jesus (Matt. xxviii. 19–20). The communities of believers, instead of attempting to satisfy their religious needs with cultic organizations or wasting their energies in social performances, sought through instruction an assured and unified conviction of the grounds of their faith as members of the body of Jesus Christ. And just as in the religion of the Old Testament priesthood and prophecy strove together, and in Greco-Roman culture religion and philosophy, so in Christianity revelation and philosophy were the two factors out of which a developing theology drew its materials. There was an inherent tendency to a unification of all the elements which could serve the nourishment of the soul and the support of Christian activities. Catechetics, systematic introduction into the Christian rites, were the motives for the collection of the reports about the work of Jesus and his relation to salvation (Luke i. 4; I Cor. xiv. 19; Gal. vi. 6; Heb. vi. 1–2). Thus with the development of the organization of the Church grew up a literature of instruction. While direct testimony to the existence of such a body of material in the early Church is not immediately attainable, it can not be doubted that in such centers of Christianity as Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople during the second century such technical material existed. Indirect testimony to this is found in the technical terms existing in patristic works which have their roots and their analogies in the terminology of rhetoric, philology, and philosophy. Instruction in the form of question and answer is suggested by the *Instituta regularia divinæ legis* of Junilius at Antioch, the *Sacra parallela* of John of Damascus, the *Quæstiones Amphilochiæ* of Photius, and the *Hupomnēstikon*

2. Theological Science in the Primitive Church.

biblion of Josephus (*MPG*, cvi. 14–177). For other varieties of instruction the homilies, corresponding to the Diatribes of the Cynic-Stoic schools, and scholia and commentaries are evidence. These are the roots of the system of instruction in dogmatic and practical theology. There soon followed the encyclopedic productions of Chrysostom (*Peri hierosynēs*), of Ambrosius (*De officiis ministrorum*), and of Augustine (*De doctrina christiana, De catechizandis rudibus, Encheiridion ad Laurentium*).

3. In the Byzantine and Middle Ages.

During the Byzantine period and the Middle Ages the pedagogic methods of patristic times passed over into the Western Church where the influx of new peoples made necessary the use of these means of instruction. In Byzantine literature heathenism and Christianity remained in a relation of easy sociability of which the *Myrobiblion* of Photius (d. 891) is an example. Philosophical activity was concerned with *Catenæ* (q.v.) which set forth authoritative traditions of exegesis, faith, and conduct of service. In the West the concern was for a practical use of the material of science, and in this direction Augustine was the leader. Under his influence Cassiodorus wrote his *Institutiones divinarum litterarum*, which was followed by the more systematic seventh and eighth books "On God, Angels and the Orders of the Faithful" of Isidor's *Originum sive etymologiarum*. In the Middle Ages the monastic schools and universities arose, the latter with their *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) and *quadrivium* (geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music). The *De institutione clericorum* of Rabanus Maurus (c. 850), the *Capitula ad presbyteros* of Hincmar, and the *Capitulare* of Hatto of Basel are specimens of the work done for the schools of the monasteries, when the monks and clergy were the leaders in the Western world. During the heyday of scholasticism appeared the *Speculum doctrinale* of Vincent of Beauvais, part of an *Omnium scientiarum encyclopædia* (4 vols., Douai, 1624). In opposition to this dialectic discipline arose a mystical type of instruction which partook more of the theological than the philosophical, illustrated by such works as the *Didascalion* of Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1141), the *Epistolæ* of Jean Gerson (d. 1429), and the *De studio theologico* of Nicholas of Clémenge (d. 1437).

4. In Humanism and the Reformation.

The Reformation and Humanism created a new science through the study of linguistics and of history. Study of language gave to theology firm standing-ground and new forms and purposes, the first results of which were attention to Scripture. Erasmus (*Ratio seu methodus perveniendi ad veram theologiam*), Melanchthon (*Brevis discendæ theologiæ ratio*), and Luther (in his maxim: *oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum*) showed the way, followed by Theobald Thamer (*Adhortatio ad theologiæ studium*, 1543), David Chytræus (*De studio theologico*, 1557), and John Gerhard (*Methodus studii theologici*, 1617). Interest in questions of encyclopedia was livelier in the Lutheran Church than in the Reformed, as shown by Bullinger's *Ratio studii theologici* and Konrad Gessner's *Pandectæ universales* (1548–49). Nevertheless the father of a systematic and thorough encyclopedia was the (Reformed) professor Andreas Gerhard of Marburg in his *De theologo seu de ratione studii theologici* (Strasburg, 1562–82), in which the division of theological science into exegetical, historical, dogmatic, and practical theology was first made. But the development of theological encyclopedia proceeded without well-formed plans; materials and methods were not carefully distinguished. Polemics too had its influence in the unfolding, and the science divided into exegetical, didactic, and polemical theology. Historical criticism had not yet come to its own, the linguistic methods of Humanism were yet dominant, and the contests between externals and internals dragged dogmatic, practical, and polemic interests into the foreground. Meanwhile philosophy, which among the Reformers had remained wedded to theology, received new impetus from Bacon and Descartes, and a new idea of the world came into existence through Copernicus and Kepler. For Bacon, theology is a positive science, independent of reason, which, however, it takes into its service. A great step had been taken toward insight into religion and toward the formation of a new basis.

5. Pietism and Rationalism Influential.

The factors which next entered into conflict with rigid scholasticism were Pietism and rationalism, different in origin and purpose, yet united in emphasis upon individualism. Under Pietism theology took on a practical-ascetic phase, it became piety. Spener gave direction to this in his *Pia desideria* (1675) and in the preface to his *De impedimentis studii theologici*. Study of the Bible is the foundation of all theology, interpretation is the mistress who orders all the parts and affords the basis; dogmatics and ethics are to come from Scripture. Historical development was lost to sight, church history simply furnished a bounding line. The orthodox cultivation of homiletics seemed to Spener the greatest hindrance to theological study, while catechetics is especially important. A. H. Franke took up Spener's thesis in *Idea studiosi theologici* (Halle, 1718) and *Methodus studii theologici* (1723), as did J. J. Breithaupt in *Exercitationes de studio theologico* (1702), J. Lange in *Institutiones studii theologici* (1723), and J. J. Rambach in *Studiosus theologiæ* (Frankfort, 1723). Related spirits were Franz Buddeus (*Isagoge historico-theologica*, Leipsic, 1727) and C. M. Pfaff (*Introductio in historiam theologiæ litterariam*, 3 vols., Tübingen, 1723), who reinstated the division into exegetical, historical, dogmatic, and practical theology. To the filling in of these outlines L. Mosheim contributed in his *Kurze Anweisung, die Gottesgelehrtheit vernünftig zu erkennen* (ed. Windheim, Helmstadt, 1756–63). Through the prevalence of the Wolffian philosophy rationalism had its influence, and the works of J. S. Semler rapidly succeeded each other (1757–80). J. A. Nösselt united a view of the materials and the literature of theology in his *Anweisung zur Kenntniss der besseren Bücher in der Theologie* (Leipsic, 1800).

Similar lines were followed in the text-books of G. S. Franke (*Theologische Encyklopädie*, vol. i., Altona, 1819), K. F Stäudlin (*Encyklopädie und Methodologic*, Hanover, 1821), and J. T. L. Danz (*Encyklopädie und Methodologie*, Weimar, 1832).

6. Schleiermacher and his Influence.

A new start was made with Schleiermacher, who in opposition to rationalism in religion wished to recover for religion its own province in a philosophic consideration of the self-consciousness of Christians. It was he who first discerned the essence of theology as subject to scientific treatment and gave to the science organic form. In this respect his *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (Berlin, 1811, enlarged, 1830) made an epoch. He showed that theology had developed out of the needs of the Church and by those needs was to be oriented. He produced a clear demarcation between philosophy and the history of religion, but he divided the science into the parts, philosophical, historical, and practical. The first governed apologetical and polemic theology; dogmatics and ethics were assigned to historical theology; and practical theology dealt with church government and church service. The operation of Schleiermacher's principles was for a time thwarted by the entrance of the Hegelian philosophy which regarded religion and its results as transitional in the march of evolution, but with the help of the growing historical and linguistic criticism it established itself ever more firmly. Meanwhile there appeared the contrast between emphasis upon the historical (Strauss's *Leben Jesu*) and Hegelian opposition between pantheism and atheism, a problem to the solution of which F C. Baur devoted himself in the history of early Christianity. Next to appear was the "Mediating theology," the fundamental thought of which was that a view of the world which includes supernaturalism is not an obstacle to scientific work. Recognizable here is the influence of Schleiermacher and Neander in the acknowledgment of a revealed character in Christianity, and of Hegel and Schelling in the tendency to speculation. The writing which best exhibits this character is A. F. L. Pelt's *Theologische Encyklopädie* (Hamburg, 1843), which makes historical theology take precedence of dogmatic and practical. Noteworthy are E. L. T. Henke's *Grundriss für Vorlesungen zur Einleitung in das theologische Studium* (Marburg, 1869), J. P. Lange's *Grundriss der theologischen Encyklopädie und Methodologie* (Heidelberg, 1877) which unites systematic and practical theology, and K. Rosenkranz's *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaft* (Halle, 1831) which seeks to use Hegel's philosophy in the construction of theological science. The "mediating theology" was left behind by K. R. Hagenbach in the work which long remained the standard (*Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaft*, Leipsic, 1833, 9th ed. with the help of E. Schürer, 1874, 11th ed. by Kautzsch, 1884, 12th ed. by Reischle, 1889). J. F. Räbiger's *Encyklopädie der Theologie* (1880) differs from R. Rothe's *Theologische Encyklopädie* (ed. Ruppelius, Wittenberg, 1880) in that it uses the historic standpoint of the Tübingen school, while Rothe gives the preference to a speculative tendency. The *Encyklopädie* of J. C. K. Hofmann (ed. Bestmann, Nördlingen, 1879) closely follows Schleiermacher in emphasizing the personal relationship of man to God, in which he was preceded by G. C. A. Harless (Nuremberg, 1837). More in the direction which Hengstenberg gave to theology is the series issued under the editorship of O. Zöckler (6 vols., Nördlingen, 1881–90) under the title *Handbücher der theologischen Wissenschaften in encyklopädischer Darstellung*.

7. Modern Problems.

The question what the present condition of theological work demands has been answered by Ritschl, who asserts as the starting-point of theology the Gospel as it lies in Scripture. This Gospel is essentially a revelation, set forth, however, in historical relations and under historic conditions. So that there results a double field of investigation, philosophical history and the internal developments of church life. On this basis, investigation of theology without reference to the Church which developed it is out of the question; it would make the Bible simply a part of the world's religious literature, deprive it of the interest derived from churchly relations, separate it from its accompanying conceptions of canon, symbol, and dogma. Yet the tendency is strong in modern times in this way to seek a universal theology. In this direction look the methodological proposals of G. Krüger (*Was heisst und zu welchem Ende studiert man Dogmengeschichte?* Freiburg, 1895; *Das Dogma vom neuen Testament*, Giessen, 1896) and W. Wrede (*Ueber Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie*, Göttingen, 1897); the former would do away with the distinction between canonical Scripture and the early patristic writings, and the latter would put the theology of the New Testament into a philosophy of religion. Another advocate of this method is C. A. Bernouilli (*Die wissenschaftliche und die kirchliche Methode in der Theologie*, Tübingen, 1897), who takes the position that the true theology is something apart from the Church and that "religion is history." This school calls its method the "purely historical." Yet can that be "purely historical" which disregards the historical fact of him who is come to save the lost? which attempts a vivisection between Church and theology which is possible only in theory? The latest development analyzes the situation into a necessity for investigation of three points: the conception of the Church, of science, and the view of the world which Christianity would set forth. The Roman Catholic conception of the Church as a sanatorium excludes the action of science, the Lutheran conception of it as a community of faith requires that action for its own good. The conception of the world as set forth by the physicist is different from that reached by the theologian and is reached by different methods. The decision upon the worth of the Scriptures of the New Testament as compared with early patristic writings in the construction of a history of dogma is helped by the consideration that the former are the classical expression from the earliest generations of Christians of the faith which had been transmitted to

them, while in the history of dogma Biblical science can not maintain itself as a separate entity over against church history and as a dogmatic fact. The history of Christianity involves the connection of the external and the internal, the latter the facts of Church life.

In countries other than Germany the development of the encyclopedia of theology runs nearly parallel with the German. In Holland the two conflicting tendencies are the Reformed and the historical schools, with a "mediating theology" between. Representative of these are for the Reformed A. Kuyper (*Encyklopedie der heilige godgeleerdheid*, 3 vols., Amsterdam, 1894); for the historical school J. T. Doedes (*Encyklopedie der christelijke theologie*, Utrecht, 1876); and for the mediating school J. Clarisse (*Encyclopœdiæ theologicæ epitome*, Leyden, 1832) and H. de Groot and L. G. Pareau (*Encyclopœdia theologi Christiani*, 3d ed., Utrecht, 1851).

8. Development outside Germany.

In England the historical school is represented by the Unitarian J. Drummond (*Introduction to the Study of Theology*, London, 1884), the Evangelical by A. Cave (*An Introduction to Theology, its Principles, its Branches, its Results, and its Literature*, 2d ed., Edinburgh, 1896). In America the mediating school is represented by P. Schaff (*Theological Propædeutic, a general Introduction to the Study of Theology* , New York, 1893), whose results are not unlike those of Hagenbach. France is represented by H. G. Kienlen (*Encyclopédie de la théologie chrétienne*, Strasburg, 1845) and E. Martin (*Introduction à l'étude de la théologie protestante*, Geneva, 1883). Schleiermacher has found a follower in Sweden in Reuterdahl, whose work was published 1837. Hagenbach's work was reproduced in Hungary by Imre Révész (1857) and practically reproduced in America by G. K. Crooks and J. F. Hurst (New York, 2d ed., 1894).

The Roman Catholic Church, while not unmoved by the movements of Humanism and the Reformation, was yet not driven from the methods of scholasticism, and its development of theological encyclopedia was in the direction of polemic and apologetics (N. J. Laforet's *Dissertatio historico-dogmatica de methodo theologiæ sive de authoritate ecclesiæ catholicæ tanquam regula fidei christianæ*, Louvain, 1849). The key-note was struck by Melchior Cano (*De locis theologicis*, Louvain, 1564), taking the Scriptures and tradition as the starting-point. The Jesuit Possevinus (*Bibliotheca selecta de ratione studiorum*, Rome, 1593) followed a revived scholasticism. Much material was furnished by the work of the Benedictines in patristics, and J. Mabillon produced an encyclopedic work in his *De studiis monasticis* (Venice, 1705). E. Du Pin's *Méthode pour étudier la théologie* (Paris, 1716, 1768, often translated) exhibited something of the breadth of Gallicanism, though the influence of the Jesuits did much to restrain this tendency. The work of P. Annato (*Apparatus ad positivam theologiam methodicus*, 2 vols., Paris, 1700, 7th ed., 1744), exhibiting a tendency toward agreement with Protestantism, was put on the Index. Under the stimulus of Protestant work after the middle of the eighteenth century a host of books by Roman Catholics appeared in Germany, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, under the influence of the philosophy of Schelling, Baader, and Gunther there were contributions by J. S. Drey (1819), H. Klee (1832), F. A. Staudenmaier (1834, 1840), A. Gengler (1834), A. Buchner (1837), and A. von Sieger (1839). Under the influence of the new dogma of infallibility J. B. Wirthmuller produced his *Encyklopädie der katholischen Theologie* (Landshut, 1873), and the scientific method was employed by H. Kihn (Freiburg, 1892). The former distinguishes between an *Ideal-* and a *Real-Encyklopädie*, the latter includes under "formal" theology the "ideal" and the "instrumental," and under "material" theology the departments of historical, doctrinal and ethical, and practical theology.

9. In the Roman Catholic Church.

(G. Heinrici.)

Bibliography: Zyto, *Versuch einer Revision der christlich theologischen Encyclopädie*, in *TSK*, 1837, pp. 680–681; W. Grimm, in *ZWT*, 1882, pp. 1–28; M. Kähler, *Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*, pp. 1–42, Leipsic, 1893. All the later and best works mentioned in the text, such as Cave, Schaff, Kuyper, and Hagenbach, discuss the subject. An excellent handbook to Roman Catholic literature is D. Gla, *Repertorium der katholisch-theologischen Litteratur*, Paderborn, 1895. Consult also: A. Dorner, *Grundriss der Encyclopädie der Theologie*, Berlin, 1901; L. Emery, *Introduction à l'étude de la théologie protestante*, pp. 1–55, Paris, 1904; E. D. Davies, *Theological Encyclopœdia*, London, 1905.

ENCYCLOPEDISTS: The name usually applied to the group of French philosophers and men of letters who collaborated in the production of the famous *Encyclopédie*, or were in sympathy with its principles. The work was planned by Denis Diderot (q.v.), and was announced as a *Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts, et des métiers.* The intention was to provide a complete alphabetical treatment of the whole field of human knowledge from the standpoint of the "Enlightenment" (q.v.). The contributors included a number of remarkable men. First in importance, acting with Diderot on equal terms, was D'Alembert. A large part of the work was done by the Chevalier de Jaucourt, a man of encyclopedic learning. Montesquieu when he died in 1755 left behind an unfinished article on "Taste." Voltaire wrote some articles, and constantly advised on the development of the plan. Rousseau contributed articles on music, but ultimately quarreled with the editors, whose plan was so different from his. Turgot wrote on economic subjects, and in the latter part of the work Haller, the physiologist, and Condorcet were engaged.

The first volume appeared in 1751, the second in the following January, and immediately excited the antagonism of the Church and the conservatives. On Feb. 12, 1752, the two volumes were suppressed by the Council, as containing maxims contrary to royal authority and to religion. Further publication was suspended for eighteen months, but from 1753 to 1757 it went on without interruption. After the seventh volume the forces of conservatism rallied to a fresh attack. The sale of the volumes already printed, as well as the printing of any more,

was forbidden. Diderot, however, made his plans to continue privately to prepare the remaining volumes. D'Alembert withdrew, but Diderot toiled on and completed the work (28 vols., Paris, 1751–72). André François Lebreton acquired a large interest in the undertaking and all the contributions were set up as they were written, but when Diderot had corrected the last proof, Lebreton and his foreman, without informing his partners, secretly cut out such parts from each article as he thought too radical or likely to give offense. In this way many of the best articles were mutilated, and to prevent the restoration of the eliminated matter, Lebreton burned the original manuscripts. Subsequently a supplement was published (5 vols., Amsterdam [Paris], 1776–77), also an index (2 vols., 1780).

The *Encyclopédie* was at once a repository of information and a polemical arsenal. It was an idea of the editors that if civilization should be entirely destroyed, mankind might turn to their volumes to learn to reconstruct it. No other collection of general information so large and so useful was then in existence. Yet mere learning was not what lay nearest to the hearts of Diderot and his fellows; they prided themselves even more on the firm and bold philosophy of some of the writers. The metaphysics is founded chiefly on Locke, who "may be said to have created metaphysics as Newton created physics," by reducing the science to "what in fact it should be, the experimental physics of the soul." Beyond this there is little unity of opinion, though the same spirit rules throughout. It includes a prejudice in favor of democracy, as the ideal form of government, and the worship of theoretical equality, but contempt for the populace, "which discerns nothing"; the reduction of religion to sentiments of morality and benevolence, and great dislike for its ministers, especially the religious orders. By its generous professions of philosophic tolerance, and apparent acquiescence in what for the moment it was too weak to overpower, the philosophic school won a hearing for doctrines which were essentially subversive of the established order of things in both Church and State, and prepared the way for overt revolution. See Deism, II.

Bibliography: J. de La Porte, *Esprit de l'encyclopédie*, Paris, 1768; F. M. A. de Voltaire, *Questions sur l'encyclopédie*, ib. 1770; W. Van Mildert, *View of the Rise and Progress of Infidelity*, i. 378, Oxford, 1839; C. Bartholmess, *Hist. critique des doctrines religieuses modernes*, Strasburg, 1855; C. A. Sainte Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, 3 vols., Paris, 1855; A. S. Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, pp. 166–178, London, 1862; E. Faguet, *Le Dix-huitième Siècle*, Paris, 1890. Consult also the literature given under Diderot, Denis.

ENDA (ENNA), SAINT, OF ARAN: Founder of the first of the great Irish monastic schools, at Killeany ("Church of Enna"), on the largest of the Aran Islands (Inishmore), off Galway Bay; d. c. 540. According to his fourteenth-century life he was of royal descent and a mighty warrior in his youth; converted by a pious sister, he became a monk. He studied in Britain (probably at Candida Casa; see Ninian, Saint), and founded a monastery on the Continent (according to some at Rome, according to others in Brittany). Returning to Ireland he established himself on Inishmore, where Ciaran of Clonmacnoise, Brendan, Finnian of Moville, Columba, and other famous abbots and bishops were among his pupils. So many resorted to the island that it received the name of Aran of the Saints. It is still full of highly interesting remains of both pagan and early Christian times.

Bibliography: Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, i. 396–400; J. Healy, *Insula sanctorum*, pp. 163–187, Dublin, 1890.

ENDERS, ERNST LUDWIG: German Lutheran; b. at Frankfort Dec. 27, 1833. He studied in Heidelberg, Erlangen, and Tübingen (1852–55), and since 1865 has been pastor at Oberrad nearly opposite to Frankfort. He prepared the second Erlangen edition of Luther's works (25 vols., Frankfort, 1862–84), and edited *Luther und Emser, ihre Streitschriften aus dem Jahre 1521* (2 vols., Halle, 1891); *Aus dem Kampfe der Schwärmer gegen Luther, drei Flugschriften* (1894); and *Johann Eberlin von Günzberg, ausgewählte Schriften* (2 vols., 1896–1900). He is a collaborator on the complete edition of Luther's works in course of preparation by J. K. Irmischer, C. S. T. Elsperger, and H. Schmidt, to which he has contributed *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel* (2 vols., covering the period from May, 1534, to July, 1536; Calw, 1903).

ENDURA. See New Manicheans.

ENERGUMEN. See Demoniac, § 5.

ENGELBRECHT, en"gel"breh', **HANS:** German mystic; b. at Brunswick Easter Day, 1599; d. there 1642. In his youth he was an apprentice to a weaver, and had little education. Even at an early age he was of a melancholy disposition, and in 1622 fell seriously ill, his disease culminating in spasms accompanied with hallucinations. Excommunicated as holding heretical doctrines of the Lord's Supper, he fled from Brunswick in 1625, and sought to work in Winsen-an-der-Aller, Lüneburg, Hamburg, and Holland, but was everywhere persecuted, although comforted by new visions and converse with the angels. Returning to Brunswick in 1631, he vainly endeavored to become reconciled with the clergy and again left the city. At Hamburg he had himself imprisoned to prove his divine power by fasting for a week. He was driven from Glückstadt by troops, and shortly before his death returned to Brunswick. His writings, based on his visions, are as follows: *Eine wahrhafftige Geschicht und Gesicht vom Himmel und der Hellen* (Brunswick, 1625); *Göttlich und himmlisch Mandat* (Bremen, 1625); *Brief an M. Hartkopf, Seniorem in Hamburg* (1640); *Ein christlich Schreiben an die Gelahrten; Ein Gesicht vom neuen Himmel und Erde;* and *Antwort, wie man Gott im Neuen Testament fragen soll* (1641); *Gesicht von den drey Ständen; Gesicht von dem Berg des Heils und dem Wasser der Sünden;* and *Schreiben an Popke Popkes.* A complete edition of the works of Engelbrecht appeared at Brunswick in 1686 (Eng. transl. by F. Okely, Northampton, 1780). (Ferdinand Cohrs.)

Bibliography: P. J. Rehtmeyer, *Braunschweig Kirchen-Historie*, iv. 417 sqq., 472 sqq., Brunswick, 1715; G. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*, iii. 217 sqq., Frankfort, 1729; W. Beste, in *ZHT*, 1844, pp. 122.

ENGELHARDT, en"gel"härt'. **GUSTAV MORITZ KONSTANTIN VON:** Lutheran theologian; b. at Dorpat July 8, 1828; d. there Dec. 5, 1881. His education was begun in Werro, a small town in Livonia, in a private institution, where he was influenced by a teacher educated in the faith of Herrnhut. From 1846 to 1849 he studied theology in Dorpat, where he came under the instruction of Philippi. In 1850 he continued his studies in Erlangen under Hofmann in whom he found a man endowed with the historic spirit, developing the course of salvation in its historical growth. In the summer of 1851 he studied at Bonn, and in 1858 he became professor of church history in Dorpat, in which position he became one of the most effective teachers of the Church in the nineteenth century. The impression which he produced rested both upon his personality, and upon his ability to sympathize with the needs and struggles of youth. He did not merely impart knowledge, he educated theological students for their practical office as well as for their academic calling.

Life.

Engelhardt's eminence showed itself especially in the science of apologetics to which he was led in 1858 by his study of Nägelsbach's books on the Homeric and post-Homeric theology. The essence of paganism lay for him in its dualistic view of the world, and he considered it the task of apologetics to investigate and discuss critically the relation of Christianity to every system of natural religion. Christian apologetics, according to him, is successful in the degree in which the uniqueness of Christianity is shown over against the common qualities of all other modes of thought; in the next place, the inner consistency of Christianity over against the contradictions and indefensibleness of all other systems should be expounded; and finally the universality of Christianity should be brought out by showing that the religious and ethical ideals of the non-Christian world are realized in Christianity. Engelhardt's conception of apologetics led him to measure faith with faith, since every non-Christian mode of thought includes within itself a system of faith which agrees in its essential points with the others. Every departure from genuine Christianity, he thought, must have been occasioned by the influence of pagan thoughts. Such pagan elements Engelhardt found, for instance, in Romanism. The knowledge of grace as the merciful love of God toward the sinner he considered the fundamental principle of Lutheranism, while the fundamental conception of the spiritual and imperishable substance of God on the part of the Roman Catholics leads, according to him, to all errors of Romanism. [The contrast intended seems to be between the personal and somewhat anthropomorphic conception of God and the metaphysical conception of him as the absolute being, which latter tended to discourage men from seeking direct communion with him and to foster Mariolatry, saint-worship, and the like.

Engelhardt as an Apologist.

A. H. N.]

The opposition of an ethical to a metaphysical conception of God shows Engelhardt's point of contact with Ritschl's views, and he was indeed greatly influenced by Ritschl's works, especially after the second edition of the latter's *Altkatholische Kirche* (1857). Here he found his strongest weapons against Baur's representation of primitive Christianity; for Ritschl held that old catholic Christianity in its departure from the fundamental views of Paul had not proceeded from a compromise between Judaic and pagan Christianity, but from a degenerate Paulinism which proceeded from an inadequate comprehension by pagan Christians of the Old-Testament basis of Pauline doctrine. Engelhardt has been mistakenly considered dogmatically dependent upon Ritschl. The two had indeed many points in common; but Engelhardt felt the lack in Ritschl's system of a full acknowledgment of sin and a corresponding holiness of God reacting against it, and of the necessity of blotting out the guilt contracted by this sin, as well as of a full appreciation of the value of God's salvation and of Christianity in particular as being a supernatural religion in the exclusive sense.

His Relations with Ritschlianism.

Engelhardt's activities included an interest in the religious instruction in secondary schools, and he wrote a treatise on its problems. He gave instruction in schools for girls, and on Sunday afternoons taught the children in a charitable institution. He also delivered public lectures, and was one of the most powerful preachers of his day. He was president of the ecclesiastical council of the university and took an active part in the Synod of Livonia and in the annual pastoral conferences which met at Dorpat.

Of his literary works may be mentioned *Der Senfkornglaube nach den Evangelien dargestellt* (Dorpat, 1861); *Die Bergpredigt nach Matthäus, eine Studie zur biblischen Geschichte* (1864); *Schenkel und Strauss, zwei Zeugen der Wahrheit* (1864). His studies in apologetics occasioned several essays which appeared in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* and the independent publication *Celsus oder die älteste Kritik biblischer Geschichte und christlicher Lehre vom Standpunkt des Heidentums* (1869). An important work in connection with his studies of primitive Christianity is *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers, eine dogmenhistorische Untersuchung über die Anfänge des katholischen Christentums* (Erlangen, 1878).

Works.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: *Zur Erinnerung an Moritz von Engelhardt*, Dorpat, 1881; *Mitteilungen und Nachricht für die evangelische Kirche in Russland*, 1882, pp. 137 sqq., 1883, pp. 209 sqq.; A. von Oettinger, *M. von Engelhardt's christlich-theologischer Entwickelungsgang*, Dorpat, 1883.

ENGELHARDT, JOHANN GEORG VEIT: German theologian and church historian; b. at Neustadt-an-der-Aisch (20 m. n.n.e. of Anspach) Nov. 12, 1791; d. at Erlangen Sept. 13, 1855. He was educated in his native town, in Baireuth, and at the University of Erlangen, and became deacon at the Altstädter Kirche and professor at the gymnasium in 1817. Three years later he entered the faculty of the university as privat-docent, was appointed associate professor of theology in 1821 and

full professor in the following year, holding this position until his death. From 1845 to 1848 he represented his university in the House of Deputies. Engelhardt's early plan of preparing a history of mystical theology was never carried out, although he made thorough preliminary studies of Plotinus, Dionysius the Areopagite, and Richard of St. Victor. He also devoted himself to Irenæus, Tertullian, the entire field of patristics, and to ecclesiastical and dogmatic history. In addition to numerous programs and studies in the *ZHT*, his principal works were as follows: *Dissertatio de Dionysio plotinizante* (Erlangen, 1820); *Die angeblichen Schriften des Areopagiten Dionysius* (2 parts, 1823); *Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen über Patristik* (1823); *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen* (1832); *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (4 vols., 1833–34); *Richard von St. Viktor und Johann Ruysbroek* (1838); *Auslegung des spekulativen Teils des Evangeliums Johannis durch einen deutschen mystischen Theologen des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts, aus einer deutschen Handschrift der königlichen Bibliothek in München* (Neustadt-an-der-Aisch, 1839); and *Dogmengeschichte* (2 vols., 1839).

(J. J. Herzog†.)

ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

I. Pre-Reformation Period.
British and Saxon Periods (§ 1).
The Norman Period (§ 2).
Pre-Reformation Resistance to Rome (§ 3).
II. History From the Reformation.
Henry VIII. (§ 1).
Edward VI. and Mary (§ 2).
Elizabeth (§ 3).
Struggle Between Anglicanism and Puritanism (§ 4).
Triumph of High-church Principles Under Stuarts (§ 5)
The Commonwealth, the Restoration, the House of Hanover (§ 6).
Deism, Rise of Methodism (§ 7).
Later History (§ 8).
III. Theology, Liturgy, Clergy, Government.
Theology (§ 1).
Liturgy (§ 2).
The Clergy (§ 3).
Government (§ 4).
Relation of Church and State (§ 5).

The Church of England, the national Church of England as by law established, may be regarded as a product of the Protestant Reformation; and from this point of view its history is held to begin with the refusal of Henry VIII. to own further allegiance to the pope, and the resultant declaration that the king was the head of the Church in his dominions. In theology it is in general harmony with Protestantism, but in government it claims to have retained in unbroken succession from the Apostles, and hence from Christ himself, the three major orders of bishop, priest, and deacon. In ritual and worship it maintains a uniform order of church service, parts of which are derived immediately from ancient and medieval rituals. It occupies an intermediate position between the Latin communion and the churches of the Reformation. Many Anglican writers regard the Reformation as merely an incident in the history of the Church of England, which did not interrupt its historic continuity, which is held to date from Augustine, and even from the old Celtic Church. A considerable number, particularly in the High-church party, look upon the Reformation as a serious mistake, if not as a crime.

I. Pre-Reformation Period:

1. British and Saxon Periods.

The first reliable information regarding the introduction of Christianity into Britain comes from Tertullian, who, early in the third century, wrote (*Adv. Jud.*, vii.; *ANF*, iii. 158) that Christianity had penetrated into regions of Britain inaccessible to the Romans. The history of the British Church was thenceforth that of early Christianity everywhere. It furnished victims to persecution, one of whom, Alban of Verulam (q.v.), was early canonized; it sent representatives to councils, for example, that of Arles (314); and it produced the heretic Pelagius (q.v.; for this entire period see Celtic Church). The Saxon period dates from the arrival, in 597, of the monk Augustine, who had been despatched by Gregory I. (see Anglo-Saxons, Conversion of the; and Augustine, Saint, of Canterbury). As archbishop of Canterbury Augustine came into conflict with the bishops of the old British, or Celtic, Church; but the Roman type of Christianity prevailed over the Celtic, and crowded it out. The differences concerned the date of Easter, the mode of the tonsure, and allegiance to Rome, the Britons being determined to remain independent of the Roman rule. Augustine called the British bishops to a colloquy on the Severn, but they refused to acknowledge his authority and Augustine invoked and predicted judgment upon them. Christianity spread rapidly in southern England, and was introduced into Northumbria by Paulinus, and made the permanent religion by the labors of St. Aidan of Ireland. Under Theodore of Tarsus (consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 668) the English episcopate was more fully organized, and the dioceses were grouped around Canterbury as the central and superior see. Theodore held synods and treated the British Christians in a high-handed way. During this period monasteries were founded; and here and there a solitary form, like Cædmon, the monk of Whitby; or Bede, "the father of learning"; or Alcuin the scholar, called to the Court of Charlemagne; or Alfred, the Christian king and patron of letters, stands out prominently. The Danish invaders of the eighth and ninth centuries interrupted the services, and devastated the property of churches and monastic orders. But the judicious wisdom and enlightened zeal of Dunstan (959–988), the first of many English ecclesiastical statesmen, repaired their ravages and effected a severer discipline and a more compact organization of the clergy. He guided the State during the nine years' reign of the invalid Eldred. During the Anglo-Saxon period papal rule won acknowledgment in increasing measure. Members of the royal family went to Rome, and Peter's pence was paid to the Roman treasury. Under the later Saxon kings the Church sank into ignorance and corruption. There were no synods; the priests were married or lived in concubinage; and simony was freely practised.

The Norman period dates from the conquest of England by William the Conqueror in 1066 under a banner blessed by Alexander II. It is distinguished by the complete vassalage into which the Church went to the papal see, the subjection of

the State to ecclesiastical domination, and the growing corruption of the clergy. But the State in turn struggled to emancipate itself from ecclesiastical fetters by legislation, and the people to rid themselves of clerical incompetency and scandal by a reform in the life and doctrine of the Church. William the Conqueror removed all the Saxon bishops except Wulfstan of Worcester and replaced them with Norman prelates. He practically chose all ecclesiastical dignitaries himself, and insisted upon the right of investiture as his royal prerogative. He withstood the claims of Gregory VIII. to rights over England as his fief. Lanfranc (q.v.), archbishop of Canterbury (1070–1089), secured the institution of special ecclesiastical courts, in which all ecclesiastical cases were tried. After Lanfranc, archbishop after archbishop contended with royalty, now for the superior rights of the Church and papal investiture, now for the liberties of the people. Lanfranc's successor Anselm (q.v.; 1093–1109), appointed by William Rufus, fought the battle of investiture and went into exile rather than receive it from the king. Under his primacy the canons against clerical marriage and concubinage (1102, 1107, 1108) were renewed by synodal action, but Eadmer reports that "almost the greater and the better part of the English clergy" were the sons of priests. The next great archbishop Thomas Becket (q.v.; 1162–1170), contended with Henry II., who sought to reform the abuses growing out of clerical exemption from civil jurisdiction. Becket's attitude called forth the famous Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164, which forbade papal briefs to be received in England without the royal consent, or prelates to go to Rome without the same consent. Though Becket was murdered, victory did not rest with the king. It remained for the State as a national body to come into subjection to the ecclesiastical power of Rome. This was accomplished during the reign of John (see LANGTON, STEPHEN; and INNOCENT III.).

2. The Norman Period.

A new era seemed to have dawned with the earnest and plain preaching of the Dominican (1221) and Franciscan friars (1224); but, becoming fat with lands, they lost their hold on the popular mind. Here and there a great bishop, like Grosseteste (q.v.; 1235–53), lifted up his voice against the corruption of the clergy, dared to resist the pope's assumption to force appointments within his diocese, and insisted upon the authority and preaching of the Scriptures. The great English chronicler Matthew Paris, in the middle of the thirteenth century, voices the protest of the people against the monetary exactions of the pope and his agents. The State was not completely paralyzed, but sought to meet ecclesiastical domination and abuses with remedial legislation. Two great acts stand out as protests against them. The statute of mortmain (1279) forbade the alienation of lands to religious corporations in such wise as to be exempt from taxation, while the statutes of præmunire and provisors (1351, 1391, etc.) made a royal license necessary to the validity of papal appointments and bulls within the realm. [The statute of *præmunire* forbade resort to foreign tribunals (the curia included) for the adjudication of ecclesiastical causes without express permission from the crown. The statute of provisors was aimed against the reservation by the pope for himself or his favorites of English benefices, with the collection of the revenues without equivalent service. In case endowed positions were kept vacant with such intent, the revenues were to go into the royal exchequer. A. H. N.] Neither of these acts accomplished much at the time, but the latter was used effectively by Henry VIII. In 1366, a parliament of Edward III. definitely refused to pay the annual tribute of a thousand marks promised by John to the apostolic see. In the fourteenth century loud protests began to be heard from the people and the clergy. John Wyclif (q.v.; 1324–1384), "the morning star of the Reformation," translated the Scriptures and asserted the rights of the State and the individual conscience. He published in 1381 twelve theses against transubstantiation, and declared that the Lord was in the sacrament as a king is in his realm. He insisted upon the practise of preaching, denounced the idleness and ignorance of the monks, defined the Church as "the organization of the elect," and called upon the pope to give up his pride and wealth. William Longland, without Erasmus' scholarship, but in a more popular and earnest vein than he, ridiculed the friars in rimes. The Lollards (q.v.) were so numerous that, according to the chronicler Knighton, every other person on the road was one. But the energetic opposition of Church and State was effective in silencing them or inducing them to recant. The statute "for burning heretics" was enacted in 1401. By the order of the Council of Constance (1415), Wyclif's ashes were disinterred and scattered in the Swift. The Church slumbered on for more than a century longer, but the great movement finally came, out of which Christianity in England, again crystallized in a distinctly national Church of England, started forward on a career of renewed life and achievement.

3. Pre-Reformation Resistance to Rome.

II. History From the Reformation: The same general principle of protest against ecclesiastical corruption was involved in the Reformation movement in England that inspired the Reformation on the Continent. Nevertheless, the movement in England had its own salient and distinguishing features, preserving in unbroken continuity the ecclesiastical orders and succession of the catholic Church. Circumstances had been preparing the way for the Reformation in England. The signs of the times in the early part of the sixteenth century indicated a mighty movement of men's minds in England as well as on the Continent, as shown by the revival of classical learning with such names as Erasmus, Colet, and Thomas More, the bold satires upon clerical abuses, the independence of thought as shown in Erasmus' appeal to the Greek New Testament in the preface of his edition (Basel, 1516), and More's dreams of improvement in Church and State in his *Utopia*.

1. Henry VIII.

Open revolt was declared in the translation of the New Testament by Tyndale (1526) and its circulation, in spite of ecclesiastical disapproval. Luther's words from across the sea, declaring papal domination to be the Babylonian captivity of the Church (1520) found an eager audience in England, nor could the public burning of his tracts by Wolsey (1521) check the growing movement against Roman Catholic rule. Henry VIII., the "defender of the faith," was then a loyal son of Rome and set himself against reform in doctrine or in ritual. The aid which his attitude came to give to the Reformation was brought about with no deliberate intention on his part. The open rupture between Rome and England, which might not inconceivably have come to pass in any case, was actually forced, not as the protest of religious principles against ecclesiastical abuses, but as a political expedient to which Henry VIII. resorted to accomplish and to justify his divorce from Catherine of Aragon and his marriage with Anne Boleyn. In 1531 Henry charged the clergy with a violation of the statute of præmunire for being accomplices with Cardinal Wolsey, who had exercised the functions of a legate without the royal consent. The two convocations compounded by the payment of £118,000; but the king, not satisfied with this evidence of a submissive temper, demanded that he should be recognized as "chief protector, the only supreme lord and head of the Church and clergy in England." The Convocation of Canterbury accepted the title, but added the limiting clause: "so far as the law of Christ will allow." In 1533 a parliamentary statute forbade all ecclesiastical appeals beyond the kingdom. The year following, impelled by the pope's command to take back Catherine, Henry secured the passage of the Act of Supremacy, which made all papal appointments within the realm illegal, and vested unlimited authority in the crown to reform and redress ecclesiastical abuses. The English Church was thus severed from the papal communion and became an independent body. It was not long before the king, in 1536–39, made a bold use of his new authority by abolishing the monastic establishments and confiscating their wealth, amounting to £38,000,000. In Thomas Cranmer (q.v.), who had helped him in his efforts to divorce Catherine, Henry found an able primate. He was a strong friend of the new views, married to a Lutheran wife, and in his earlier life was strongly Lutheran in doctrine. The king, however, had little or no sympathy with the Continental Reformation. He attacked Luther in a tract on the seven sacraments, and Luther's rude reply confirmed Henry's mind against the Reformation. The articles adopted by Convocation in 1536 retained the doctrine of the Real Presence, the use of images, prayers to saints, purgatory, and auricular confession, and only divested these practises of some gross superstitions. The king seemed to take higher ground when he gave his sanction to the translation of the Scriptures known as the Great Bible (1539). But all hopes of a thorough doctrinal reformation were doomed to disappointment. The six so-called "Bloody Articles" of 1539 denounced all denial of transubstantiation as heresy, and declared strongly in favor of auricular confession, the celibacy of the clergy, and the sacrifice of private masses. The punishment for denying transubstantiation was burning.

2. Edward VI. and Mary.

Under Edward VI. (1548–53), the doctrinal reformation was accomplished. The six articles were repealed, and sympathy with the Continental Reformers was shown in the call of Butzer and Fagius to Cambridge, and of Peter Martyr and Ochino to Oxford. A Prayer-Book was issued in 1549, the Forty-Two Articles were drawn up in 1552. They declared that "the Church of Rome hath erred not only in its living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith" (xix.); expressly denied transubstantiation; permitted the marriage of the clergy; discontinued auricular confession; and approved of the communion in both kinds. With their adoption the formative period of the Church of England closes. The reign of Mary (1553–58), a firm adherent of the Roman Catholic faith, checked the Reformation for the moment, but did not crush it, though a determined effort was made to restore papal control over the English Church, the intolerance of the age being freely employed. Hooper, Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer were brought to the stake, and many refugees fled to Basel and Geneva; but these persecutions, which were attributed largely to Spanish influence, Mary being married to Philip II., only awakened dogged resistance. The number of certified executions for religious reasons during her reign was 286, of which forty-six were of women.

3. Elizabeth.

The accession of Elizabeth restored the independence of the Church of England, which, in spite of occasional resistance from within and papal opposition from without (1570), became the permanent religious home of the large majority in the land, and was firmly established by the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. Two periods stand out in the history of the Church under Elizabeth. In the early part of her reign the separation of the National Church from the Roman Catholic see was completed, and in the latter part the conflict between Anglicanism and Puritanism deepened and resulted in the victory of the Anglican school. The queen was no zealous reformer, but directed the affairs of the Church with the keen sagacity of a statesmanship which placed national unity and the peace of the realm above every other consideration. In the first year of her reign the Act of Supremacy was renewed and the Act of Uniformity (q.v.) was passed. By the former all allegiance to foreign princes or prelates was forbidden; by the latter the use of the liturgy was enforced. The royal title of "Defender of the Faith and Supreme Head of the Church" was retained, with the slight alteration of "Head" to "Governor"; but the deprecation was struck out of the Litany which read, "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us." The queen retained, against the protest of bishops, an altar, crucifix, and lighted candles in her own chapel, disapproved of the marriage of the clergy,

interrupted the preacher who spoke disparagingly of the sign of the cross, and imperiously forced her wishes upon unwilling prelates. But in spite of seeming to approximate the Church of Rome in points of ritual, Elizabeth did not interfere by any public measures with the results of the Reformation of Edward VI. The reduction of the Forty-two Articles to thirty-nine (1563), the form which they have ever since retained, did not impair their Protestant character.

4. Struggle Between Anglicanism and Puritanism.

The independence of the National Church being thus permanently settled, it remained only to settle disputes within her own pale. The great question was whether Puritanism should be tolerated. This was a question not of doctrine, for the prevailing doctrinal views were Calvinistic, and Elizabeth's bishops, almost without exception, were Calvinists. It was a question of ecclesiastical polity, ritual, and vestments. Many of the refugees who had fled to the Continent in Mary's reign returned strongly prejudiced against an elaborate ritual, and in favor of the Genevan form of government. Thomas Cartwright (q.v.), Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge, was the ablest exponent of these views (1570). There was no uniformity practised in the conduct of public services and the dress of the clergy. Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, who had died at the stake in 1555, for a long time refused to be consecrated from conscientious scruples against the usual episcopal robes, and Bishop Jewel pronounced the clerical garb a stage dress and a "relic of the Amorites." It is noteworthy that two of Elizabeth's archbishops, Matthew Parker and Edmund Grindal (qq.v.), were averse to enforcing uniformity in these matters. The latter, with Bishops Parkhurst and Ponet, not only would have allowed a coordinate authority to the presbyterian system of Geneva, but would have gone even farther. Grindal incurred suspension from his office as primate by disobeying the queen's command to suppress the Puritan "prophesyings," or informal religious harangues. By a royal proclamation these were suppressed, and a royal proclamation had already required the use of clerical vestments. It thus was decided that no unrestricted license in the conduct of public worship and clerical dress was to be tolerated. These acts made many of the Puritan clergy see fit to resign their benefices. In Grindal's successor, John Whitgift (q.v.), Elizabeth had a prelate to her hand. The breach between the two parties became wider; and if the Church, on her part, refused to countenance any dissidence, the Puritans, on their part, became coarse, as in the so-called Marprelate controversy (1588), when they issued scurrilous libels against the queen and bishops (see MARPRELATE TRACTS). The controversy was closed in 1593 by an act of Parliament which made Puritanism an offense against the statute law. After the defeat of the Spanish Armada, some Puritans were put to death and others took refuge in Holland, and later in America. See PURITANS, PURITANISM.

5. Triumph of High-church Principles Under Stuarts.

The history of the seventeenth century is marked by the consolidation of the Church of England in spite of a temporary triumph of Puritanism, and by the development of the doctrine of the divine appointment of episcopacy, the first indications of which showed themselves in the Puritan controversies of the Elizabethan period, with a consequent uncompromising resistance to all dissent in ritual and doctrines, culminating in the repressive legislation of Charles II. Under James I. (1603–25), who came from Scotland to England with a cordial hatred of Presbyterianism, the Puritan party was completely humiliated. All the Puritan hopes expressed in the famous Millenary Petition, signed by eight hundred clergymen, and asking for the removal of "superstitious usages" from the Prayer-Book, etc., were doomed to disappointment; although James won the approval of Churchmen and dissenters alike by the preparation, under his auspices, of the authorized version of the English Bible which appeared in 1611 (see HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE). James retained relations with the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and sent five commissioners to represent the Church of England at the Synod of Dort, with instructions to "favor no innovations in doctrine, and to conform to the confessions of the neighboring Reformed churches." But full sympathy with the Continental churches was hereafter impracticable, and recognition of their orders (as was the case under Elizabeth) impossible, by the High-church views of episcopacy which were spreading, and which, under Charles I. (1625–49) and Archbishop Laud (q.v.; 1633–45), assumed an extreme form. The latter taught that episcopacy was not only necessary to the well-being, but essential to the very existence of the Church. His administration revived, to the Low-church and Puritan mind, the ritual of Rome, and displayed so much sympathy with it that he was said to have been offered a cardinal's hat. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury (1611–35), was a strict Calvinist, but he could not check the growth of the Arminian views advocated by Laud, whose fidelity to his principles brought him to the block in 1645. He and Charles I. have since been regarded as martyrs by a school of Anglicans who reprobate everything that savors of Puritanism as contrary to the Church and to God. Since his day a large liberty of opinion has been allowed and practised in the Church of England on the question of ritual and episcopacy; the High-church views of Laud, and the Low-church views of Parker and Grindal, both having their representatives.

6. The Commonwealth, the Restoration, the House of Hanover.

During the Commonwealth, the Established Church was, in fact, a *religio illicita*, an act of Parliament having abolished episcopacy, and discontinued the use of the Litургy (Sept. 10, 1642). Puritanism triumphed for a time, and the Westminster Assembly (q.v.) in 1643 established a Presbyterian kingdom; but in spite of the strong theological intellects which supported it, and in spite of the massive will of Cromwell, who was not a Presbyterian, but an Independent, Puritanism

was a failure in England. The accession of Charles II. (1660) restored the Church of England to the national position which it has ever since held. Stern measures against the Puritans soon followed. By the Act of Uniformity (q.v.) of 1662, the use of the Prayer-Book was rigidly enforced; and two thousand English clergymen, among them some of the most scholarly and pious divines of the time (such as Baxter and Howe), were deprived of their benefices. These penalties for dissent were increased by the Five-Mile Act (q.v.) of 1665, while the Test Act (q.v.) of 1673, by excluding all Puritans from office, marked the culmination of legislation against dissenters. Charles II. died, it is commonly held, a Roman Catholic, and his brother, James II., lived as one; but the nation was against him, and his efforts to restore confidence and toleration for the Roman Church failed. The accession of William and Mary in 1688 ushered in a new epoch. The principle that the Established Church had an exclusive right to existence and protection was abrogated. The movement in favor not only of toleration but of absolute freedom of worship and political equality without reference to ecclesiastical connection began with this reign. Put into more and more extensive practise, this principle has effected the abolition of most, if not all, political disabilities on account of religious differences. The first legislation in this direction was the Act of Toleration (q.v.) of 1689 establishing freedom of worship. The nineteenth century witnessed the repeal of the Test Act (1828), the removal of the disabilities of the Roman Catholics (1829) and Jews (1858), and the disestablishment of the Irish Church (1868).

7. Deism, Rise of Methodism.

The eighteenth century was characterized by a wide-spread religious apathy and worldliness among the clergy, and witnessed the culmination of Deism, which identified Christian revelation with natural religion, and excluded from Christianity, as ungenuine and false, all that was not contained in the latter (see DEISM). But the influence of Deism was more than counteracted by the Evangelical spirit and activity of Whitefield and the Wesleys, graduates of Oxford, which worked with irresistible power upon the masses, and aroused the clergy out of their indifference to a new sense of their spiritual obligations. John Wesley (q.v.; 1702–91), the founder of the movement, a man of notable power of organization as well as a great preacher, reached the masses and spoke as no single individual had spoken to England since Wyclif. Charles Wesley (q.v.) gave the English people some of its best hymns. Whitefield (q.v.) in America as well as in England made the reputation of the greatest popular preacher England had produced. Against his will John Wesley founded a new church organization (see METHODISTS). Fresh life sprang up in the Church of England as a result of this revival of practical religion. The so-called Evangelicals, including some of the most famous pastors, fervent preachers, devout poets, and self-sacrificing philanthropists—men like Venn and Newton and Cowper and Wilberforce—brought a warm consecration to their work and vied with the more eloquent and equally devoted leaders of the Methodist movement in spreading the truths of vital religion. The century closed with an intense sympathy for the heathen abroad and the depraved classes at home. Sunday Schools were organized by the layman Robert Raikes of Gloucester in 1780, and in 1799 the Church Missionary Society was founded, while later still the movement which resulted in the abolition of the slave-trade was inaugurated by Wilberforce.

8. Later History.

The nineteenth century was characterized by earnest philanthropic movements, by the rise of the Oxford Movement, which profoundly influenced the Church (see TRACTARIANISM), and by the close affiliation with the Episcopal churches in the United States and the English colonies. The British and Foreign Bible Society united Churchmen and dissenters in a common enterprise, and the Evangelical Alliance, in 1846, again sought to unify them in spirit and prayer. No preceding period was distinguished for piety at once more practical and more liberal. However, the Church received a blow which, in the eyes of her opponents, threatened to crush her, when John Henry Newman, Henry Edward Manning, Frederick W Faber, and other men of eminence among both the clergy and the laity became converts to the Roman Catholic communion. A far different school, equally devoted to the Church of England, but adhering to Reformation rather than to Anglo-Catholic tenets, included such men as the Hares, F D. Maurice, and Archbishop Whateley. In the last half of the century Biblical scholarship was carried on to a high point by such men as Archbishop Trench, Dean Alford, Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott of Durham, Bishop Ellicott, Dean Stanley, and Professors Hatch and Hort, not to mention the living. These Biblical studies culminated in the movement to revise the English translation of the Bible (see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., § 7). The High-church party lays emphasis upon the exclusive right of episcopacy and apostolic succession, and maintains an advanced ritual, together with insistence on the doctrines of the Real Presence and baptismal regeneration. The extreme wing has reintroduced practises abrogated under Lutheran and Calvinistic influence, such as veneration of the Blessed Sacrament, auricular confession, communion in one kind for the laity, and the establishment of monastic orders. They are distinguished for the elaborate and reverent character of their services, for the frequent celebration of the Eucharist, which is held to be sacrificial, and for their great zeal and devotion in benevolent church work. Occupying opposite ground is the Low-church party, which holds strictly to the natural interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles (q.v.), denies episcopacy to be of the essence of the Church, and denounces so-called ritualistic practises. Between these two schools a third has grown up since the middle of the nineteenth century. Its combination of tolerant, and sometimes latitudinarian, sympathies with loyalty to the Church has secured for it the name of the Broad-church party. Among its more prominent representatives have been Arnold, Julius Hare,

Maurice, Kingsley, and Stanley. During the nineteenth century the vigorous life of the Church was further shown by the restoration of cathedrals and the construction of churches, in the creation of new episcopal sees at home and the rapid extension of the Church and episcopate in the colonies. In addition to the Parliamentary acts bearing on the rights of Churchmen were the Compulsory Church Rate Abolition Act (1868) relieving dissenters of church taxation, and the University Test Act (1871) throwing open the universities to all irrespective of creed.

III. Theology, Liturgy, Clergy, Government: The doctrinal standards of the Anglican Church are the Thirty-Nine Articles (q.v.) and the Book of Common Prayer (see COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF). To these may be added the

1. Theology. Catechism and the two Books of Homilies (see HOMILIARIUM) issued in the reign of Edward VI. and sanctioned by the Thirty-nine Articles. Within the pale of the Church the most divergent views have prevailed concerning its doctrinal status. On the one hand, it has been represented as strongly Calvinistic, both in respect to the sacraments and to the decrees; on the other hand, theologians such as Newman (before his conversion to the Roman Catholic faith), Bishop Forbes of Brechin, and Pusey hold that nothing is taught in the Thirty-nine Articles which can not be harmonized with the Tridentine decrees. An unprejudiced study of the wording of the Articles, without any inferences from what is left unsaid, shows that they teach a moderate Calvinism, and are in all essentials in sympathy with the Protestant Reformation of the Continent. The sole and supreme authority of the Scriptures is emphasized (Art. vi.), as is the doctrine of justification by faith, Art. xi. reading: "Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine," etc. Original sin is the corruption by nature of every descendant of Adam (Art. ix.); and predestination is the everlasting purpose of God to redeem "those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind" (Art. xvii.). The doctrines of purgatory, celibacy, etc., are specifically denounced (Arts. xxii., xxxii.). The teaching concerning the Eucharist is plainly against transubstantiation, which, in Art. xxviii., is declared to be "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," the "Body of Christ" being "given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." While Art. xxvii. can scarcely be said unreservedly to set forth the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, the case is different in the Office for Baptism in the Prayer-Book. After the child has been baptized, the priest says: "Seeing now that this Child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church"; and again, after repeating the Lord's Prayer, he gives thanks to God for regenerating the infant, etc. These words, naturally interpreted, teach baptismal regeneration, although by Low-churchmen they are frequently explained as being used in a hypothetical sense.

The worship of the Church of England is liturgical and is regulated by the Book of Common Prayer. Its beautiful forms of service, and its solemn and venerable prayers, are not only among the choicest specimens of English, but exert on the ear and heart of those who hear them an in-

2. Liturgy. fluence which nothing else can replace. The rubrics (so called from having originally been written or printed in red ink) give directions for the minutest details of the service. Provision is made for daily morning and evening prayer, these services consisting of prayers, anthems (*Te Deum*, *Benedicite*, *Magnificat*, *Nunc Dimittis*, etc.), one lesson from the Old and one from the New Testament, the Creed, and the sermon. After morning prayer on Sunday, Wednesday, and Friday, a Litany of great beauty and comprehensiveness should be recited; and the Eucharist, for which a separate liturgy is provided, is celebrated at varying intervals, as often as once daily in many High churches. The original purpose was obviously to have a celebration at least once each week. Twenty-nine feasts are observed, while Lent and Advent, with certain other days, are fasts. The forms for baptism, confirmation, marriage, burial, and ordination are prescribed. The creeds are the Apostles,' Nicene, and Athanasian, the last-named assailed by a strong faction. Any departure, even in the smallest detail, from the Book of Common Prayer is illegal.

The clergy of the Church of England consists of three orders—deacons, priests (presbyters), and bishops. The canonical age is respect-

3. The Clergy. ively twenty-three, twenty-four, and thirty. The duties of the deacon are to render assistance to the priest in the service of the sanctuary and in pastoral work. He may preach, read the prayers and Scripture lessons, assist in the distribution of the elements at communion, and administer baptism. The priest serves at the altar and consecrates the elements in the Eucharist. At his ordination the bishop pronounces upon him the words "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God," etc., this being interpreted either as a petition for the anointing of the Holy Spirit or as marking the transmission of a heavenly grace through the bishop. The bishop has the exclusive right of ordination, confirmation, and the consecration of churches. Bishops are appointed by the crown. A *congé d'élire* is sent to the chapter when a bishopric is vacant, but it is a mere formality, as the name of the new appointee is sent with it. In the case of bishoprics recently established, as Manchester, St. Albans, Liverpool, Truro, Newcastle, and Southwell, they are conferred directly by letters patent from the crown. Deans have charge of cathedral churches and are assisted by canons, the number of which may not exceed six for any cathedral. The archdeacon assists the bishop in his official duties as superintendent of the diocese. He holds synods, delivers charges, and visits parishes. He is sometimes aided by rural deans. Both these classes are members of Convocation by virtue of their office. No bishop is allowed to transgress the limits of his diocese in the performance of episcopal functions unless requested so to do. The bishops frequently associate with themselves suffragan bishops.

England is divided into the two archbishoprics

of Canterbury and York. In 1906 there were within the limits of the former twenty-five sees, and within the latter nine. In order of dignity the archdioceses and dioceses rank: Canterbury, York, London, Durham, Winchester, etc. In connection with the Church of England and Wales there are also twenty-one suffragan bishops and two assistant bishops. The Irish Church, disestablished in 1869, has two archbishops and eleven bishops, and the Scotch Episcopal Church has seven bishops. The first colonial see was that of Nova Scotia, which was created in 1787 There are thirty-two deans presiding over as many cathedrals, but the deans of Westminster and Windsor are independent of episcopal control, and are subject directly to the crown. There are ninety-three archdeacons and 810 rural deans. The clergy of the Church in priest's orders in England and Wales are called "rector," "vicar," "curate," etc., and at the census of 1901 numbered 25,235. The benefices, or livings, number nearly 14,080. Their patronage is divided between the crown (1,150 livings), the bishops (1,853), the universities (770), private patrons (6,200) etc. (see ENGLAND AND WALES.) The consent of the bishop of the diocese is necessary to the induction of an incumbent; and, in the event of a disagreement between patron and bishop, the case is decided by the Court of Arches. The people have no voice in the choice of their rector, but the rector, once inducted, has absolute control of his church, so that not even the bishop may enter it without his consent. Many of the parishes have endowments in lands; others are supported, in whole or in part, from public funds, such as Queen Anne's Bounty. The system of patronage has led to abuses, some of which still remain. On the other hand, the plurality system, by which a clergyman might hold any number of livings at the same time, and which was so much abused in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has been rectified by parliamentary legislation. Under the present law no one can hold two cathedral positions at the same time. The holder of a cathedral position may hold only one parish besides. A clergyman may have two parishes; but if the one numbers three thousand, the other may not include more than five hundred. The evils of non-residence have likewise been restrained by law. The yearly income of the Church of England from voluntary contributions amounts to something more than £8,000,000 and the income from ancient endowments to £5,500,000. Of this income the archbishop of Canterbury receives £15,000, and the archbishop of York £10,000; the bishop of London £10,000, and the bishop of Durham £8,000. The see with the smallest income is that of the bishop of Sodor and Man, which amounts to £2,000. Deans on the average receive £1 000; and the clergy from £150 upward. A fund managed by the "Ecclesiastical Commission," and supplied by the revenues of suppressed canonries, sinecures, and the surplus revenues of bishoprics over and above the episcopal salary, is used for the augmentation of bishoprics, the increase of the smaller salaries, the endowment of new churches, etc.

4. Government.

The Church of England is one of the estates of the realm. Its relation to the State is one of dependence, the sovereign being its supreme governor, and Parliament its highest legislature. The archbishop of Canterbury is the first peer in the realm and crowns the king. The bishops (see EPISCOPACY, IV.) have their "palaces," and seats in the House of Lords, except the bishop of Sodor and Man. As for the rest, excepting the bishops of London, Winchester, and Durham (who always sit), they have seats only after their appointment to the House of Lords. The Church does not legislate for itself independently or directly; it is subject to Parliament. The convocations of Canterbury and York are the two highest official church bodies. Convocation is assembled by the king's writ, and can not proceed to make new canons without his license, nor are its decisions valid till confirmed by his sanction (see CONVOCATION). Judicial business is transacted in three courts. The lowest is the diocesan Consistory Court, presided over by the bishop's chancellor. Appealed cases go up to the Court of Arches, the official head of which is styled Dean of the Arches (see ARCHES, COURT OF). The last tribunal of appeal is the king in council, or the judicial committee of the Privy Council. There are three church censures: suspension (for the neglect of parish duties), deprivation, and degradation. The two latter follow upon the disuse of the Prayer-Book, teachings subversive of the Thirty-nine Articles, simony, or conviction in a civil court. The Court of Arches alone exercises the right of deprivation.

5. Relation of Church and State.

In 1888 the first Lambeth Synod was held which included the bishops of the Church of England and the Colonies and all the Protestant Episcopal churches of America (see LAMBETH CONFERENCE; LAMBETH ARTICLES). As in America, it should be noted, the opposition of a wing of the Low-church party to the Oxford Movement led to the formation of the Free Church of England (q.v.) as well as to the introduction into England of the Reformed Episcopal Church (q.v.). D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For a comprehensive list of the literature the fullest treatment is in the *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*, in six parts, under the entry "England." The titles of the most important recent works (1889-1905) are collected in the *Subject Index* issued by the trustees of the British Museum, under the entry "England," in which a section is devoted to the Church of England. A very necessary volume is C. Gross, *Sources and Literature of English History . to About 1485*, London, 1900. The reader is referred also to the bibliographies appended to the articles on the individual worthies of that communion in this work, and to such articles as COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF; THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES; and WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

For general treatment the pertinent works of the English historians Lingard (Roman Catholic; able), Freeman, Froude, Green, Ranke, H. D. Traill (*Social England*, 6 vols., London, 1893-97, 3d ed. in progress), Gardiner, and Lecky are to be consulted, as well as the monumental *Dictionary of National Biography*. As sources the superlatively important *Rolls Series* may not be overlooked, as well as the publications of the Camden and Surtees Societies. *Bohn's Antiquarian Library*, 41 vols., London, 1848 sqq., contains the medieval English chroniclers and other valuable works. On the Reformation the publications of the Parker Society are to be noted; also Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, best ed., 8 vols., London, 1843; J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation* (and other works),

27 vols., Oxford, 1822–28; G. Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 7 vols., Oxford, 1865; D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, new ed., 2 vols., London, 1843; cf. also F. Seebohm, *Oxford Reformers*, 3d ed., London, 1887; and the general works upon the Reformation.

On the general history consult: the *Opera* of Bede; J. Ussher, *Ecclesiarum Britannicarum antiquitates*, in the *Works*, ed. C. R. Elrington, 16 vols., Dublin, 1847–62; E. Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicæ*, ed. Pantin, 2 vols., Oxford, 1842; T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain*, ed. J. Nichols, 3 vols., London, 1868; J. Inett, *Origines Anglicanæ*, ed. J. Griffiths, 3 vols., Oxford, 1855 (in continuation of Stillingfleet); J. Collier, *Eccl. Hist. of Great Britain*, best ed., 9 vols., London, 1840 (goes through the reign of Charles II.); J. Grant, *Hist. of the English Church and of the Sects, . . with Answers to Each Dissenting Body*, 4 vols., London, 1811–25 (goes through the reign of George III.); E. Cardwell, *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England, 1546–1716*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1844; G. Weber, *Geschichte der akatholischen Kirchen und Sekten von Grossbritannien*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1845–53; J. S. M. Anderson, *Hist. of the Church of England in the Colonies*, 3 vols., London, 1858; G. G. Perry, *Hist. of the Church of England*, 3 vols., ib. 1862–64; R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*, 4 vols., ib. 1878–91; A. Martineau, *Church Hist. in England to the Reformation*, ib. 1878; R. Barclay, *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, 2 vols., ib. 1879; E. Churton, *The Early English Church*, ib. 1879; J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in England, 1640–1800*, 6 vols., ib. 1881; idem, *Religion in England during the First Half of the Present Century*, 2 vols., ib. 1884; C. J. Abbey and J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the 18th Century*, 2 vols., ib. 1887; W. Stubbs, *Registrum sacrum Anglicanum*, Oxford, 1897; a new ed. of Stubbs' Lectures on *Early English Church Hist.*, ed. A. Hassall, appeared, ib. 1906; W. A. Shaw, *Hist. of the English Church, 1640–1660*, 2 vols., ib. 1900; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, 2 vols., ib. 1903. Convenient handbooks are: G. G. Perry, *Student's Church Hist. of England*, 3 vols., ib. 1878–87; A. C. Jennings, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, ib. 1882; H. Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion*, Oxford, 1898; H. C. G. Moule, *Evangelical School in the Church of England; its Men and its Work in the 19th Century*, London, 1901; A. Plummer, *English Church Hist., 1509–1702*, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1904–07; T. Allison, *Lectures on English Church Hist., . . 1702*, London, 1906; A. Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, ib. 1906 (Roman Catholic); S. R. Maitland, *The Reformation in England*, New York, 1906; H. N. Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement, a Study of Contemporary Documents*, London, 1907 (Roman Catholic); J. H. Overton, *The Anglican Revival*, New York, 1907; W. B. Carpenter, *Popular Hist. of the Church of England*, London, 1908; G. R. Balleine, *A Hist. of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England*, ib. 1908.

On councils and church law: D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, 4 vols., London, 1737; E. Cardwell, *Synodalia, a Collection of Articles of Religious Canons and Proceedings of Convocation in the Province of Canterbury*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1842; F. Makower, *The Constitutional Hist. and Constitution of the Church of England*, London, 1895; R. J. Phillimore, *The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England*, ed. W. G. F. Phillimore and C. F. Jemmett, 2 vols., London, 1895; W. Stubbs, *The Constitutional Hist. of England*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1897; idem, *Select Charters of English Court Hist.*, ib. 1900; F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, London, 1898; H. H. Henson, *The National Church; Essays on its Hist. and Constitution*, ib., 1908; Gee and Hardy, *Documents*.

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Established Church (§ 1).
Presbyterians and Methodists (§ 2).
Congregationalists, Baptists, Calvinistic Methodists (§ 3).
Salvation Army, Minor Denominations, Roman Catholics (§ 4).
Theological Schools (§ 5).

England and Wales constitute two divisions of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. They are divided into fifty-two counties, forty in England and twelve in Wales, and have an area of 58,323 square miles and a population (1901) of 32,526,075. The established Church is the Church of England (see ENGLAND, CHURCH OF), but all other religious bodies are fully recognized and tolerated, and no civil disability attaches to any class of British subjects because of their religious beliefs or unbelief. Since no religious census of Great Britain has recently been taken, the statistics of the present article are drawn from year-books and other sources, so that the figures represent not only different years, but also refer sometimes to England alone, sometimes to England and Wales, and sometimes to the British Isles.

1. Established Church.

In the Established Church in England and Wales there are two archbishops, thirty-five bishops, thirty suffragan and two assistant bishops. Under the bishops are thirty-two deans, ninety-five archdeacons, and eight hundred and ten rural deans. For the management of ecclesiastical affairs, each of the archbishoprics, or "provinces," has a council, or Convocation (q.v.), consisting of the bishops, archdeacons, and deans in person, and of a certain number of proctors as the representatives of the clergy. These councils are summoned by the respective archbishops in pursuance of the king's command. When assembled, they must have the king's license before they can deliberate and also the sanction of the crown to their resolutions before they are binding on the clergy, so that their actual power is extremely limited. The number of civil parishes (districts for which a separate poor rate is or can be made) was 14,900 at the census of 1901. These, however, seldom coincide with ecclesiastical parishes, which, during recent years, have lost their old importance, the ancient parishes having been frequently divided into districts, each of which is virtually an independent parish. Of such parishes there were 14,080 in 1901, including those of the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands. Since 1818 the Church Building Society and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have formed upward of 3,000 new ecclesiastical parishes. Each parish has its church, presided over by an incumbent in priest's orders, and known as rector, vicar, or perpetual curate according to his relation to the temporalities of his parish. Private persons possess the right of presentation to about 8,500 benefices; the patronage of the others belongs mainly to the king, the bishops and cathedrals, the Lord Chancellor, and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The census returns for 1901 gave the number of the clergy of the Church of England as 25,235. In 1905 there were 14,029 incumbents and about 7,500 curates and unbeneficed clergy, while the non-active list comprised about 4,000. The church accommodation, according to returns by 13,948 incumbents, was as follows: in parish churches, 5,774,608; in chapels-of-ease, 674,038; in mission-rooms, etc., 733,607; total 7,182,253. The number of communicants was estimated at 2,223,207; of Sunday School teachers at 209,338; of Sunday School scholars at 2,467,902. The gross annual income of the clergy in 1904–05 was estimated at £4,539,350, and the net income at £3,574,430. The amount of the voluntary contributions

in 1904–05 was put approximately at £8,029,714, of which £2,290,247 were expended by central societies, institutions, etc., for home and foreign missions and other educational and philanthropic works, while £5,546,029 consisted of funds applied to local purposes, such as elementary education, the support of the clergy, and general parochial work, and £193,437 were for the extension of the episcopate in England. Of 29,632 churches and chapels registered for the solemnization of marriage in 1904, 15,538 belonged to the Established Church and 14,094 to other religious denominations.

2. Presbyterians and Methodists.

The Presbyterian Church of England had, in 1907, twelve presbyteries, 345 congregations, fifteen preaching stations, and 85,755 members. It has a theological college and supports seventy-eight missionaries abroad, including thirty-three women. In 1905 the amount raised for all purposes was £304,613. Other Presbyterian divisions in England are the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, Eastern Reformed Synod, United Original Seceders, and Synod of the Church of Scotland in England (see PRESBYTERIANS). Under the general designation of Methodists (q.v.) are included all those religious bodies which owe their existence, directly or indirectly, to the efforts of John and Charles Wesley. The most numerous and influential of them are the Wesleyan Methodists, the original body founded in 1739. They are governed primarily by the Conference and secondarily by the Synods, the latter being semi-annual meetings of the ministers and selected laymen in each district, with a chairman appointed by the Conference, which is now composed of 300 ministers and an equal number of laymen, with a ministerial president and secretary elected annually. There are likewise quarterly meetings of the ministers and lay officers of each circuit. The authority of both the latter bodies is subordinate to that of the Conference. They reported for Great Britain in 1907 2,445 ministers, 19,672 lay preachers, 539,146 church members, 7,566 Sunday Schools, 133,108 officers and teachers, 1,000,819 scholars, and 8,520 churches with seating capacity of 2,326,228. Various divisions of Methodists have been formed, the most important being (1) the Methodist New Connexion, formed in 1797 by Alexander Kilham, (2) Primitive Methodists, (3) Bible Christians, and (4) United Methodist Free Churches (see METHODISTS).

3. Congregationalists, Baptists, Calvinistic Methodists.

The Independents or Congregationalists reject episcopacy and presbyteries. In 1907 they had fifty-one county and other associations in England and Wales, with 4,661 churches and preaching stations containing 1,694,879 sittings; the number of ministers in the British Isles was then 3,253. Of these 238 were temporarily without pastoral charge, seventy-nine were engaged in collegiate and tutorial duties, forty-four were occupied in secretarial work, and 378 had retired from the active pastorate because of old age or ill health (see CONGREGATIONALISTS). The Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion, with forty-four chapels and mission stations, is the outcome of the eighteenth century revival. It is governed by nine trustees assisted by an annual conference of ministers and delegates. The Baptists, like the Congregationalists, are grouped for the most part in associations of churches, the majority of which belong to the Baptist Union, formed in 1813. In England and Wales there were, in 1907, 6,706 churches and chapels and 1,972 pastors. The members numbered 405,244, the Sunday School teachers 57,240, and the Sunday School scholars 564,939. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Connexion (see PRESBYTERIANS) is the only church of purely Welsh origin, and embraces a very large section of the Welsh-speaking population. The form of Church government is Presbyterian, and the Church is in federation with the United Free Church of Scotland and with the Presbyterian Church of England. In 1906 the denomination had 1,411 churches; 1,620 chapels and places of worship; 1,248 ministers and preachers; 5,946 deacons; 189,164 communicants; 3,050 on probation; 27,112 Sunday School teachers; and 195,227 Sunday School scholars. For the concerted movement of non-conformists against prelacy see FREE CHURCH FEDERATION.

4. Salvation Army, Minor Denominations, Roman Catholics.

The Salvation Army (q.v.) is one of the most recent religious denominations and one of the most successful. In Aug., 1906, the number of officers, cadets, and employees was 20,077, of corps and outposts 7,680, and of local officers 45,320. Connected with the Salvation Army are numerous philanthropic institutions under various denominations, including 110 rescue houses for fallen women, 132 slum posts, fifteen prison-gate homes, 183 shelters and cheap food depots for the homeless, 102 workshops and factories, forty-five labor bureaus, thirteen farms, etc. Among the minor denominations the most important are the Unitarians with about 350 ministers and 345 chapels and other places of worship. The Society of Friends (q.v.) has 18,466 members in Great Britain, 424 recorded ministers, including over 150 women, and 421 places of worship. The Churches of Christ have 13,844 members and 179 churches in the British Isles, with 153 Sunday Schools, 1,583 teachers, and 16,041 scholars. The Moravians (q.v.) have about fifty congregations and preaching stations. The Free Church of England (q.v.) has twenty-four ministers, twenty-seven churches, 1,352 communicants, 8,140 sittings, 361 Sunday School teachers, and 4,196 Sunday School scholars. The Reformed Episcopal Church has twenty-eight ministers, 1,990 communicants, 6,000 sittings, 256 Sunday School teachers, and 2,600 Sunday School scholars (see REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH). The Catholic Apostolic Church (q.v.) has about eighty churches; the New Jerusalem Church (q.v.) has seventy-five societies, with 6,063 registered members; the Mormons (q.v.) have eighty-two churches; and the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.) have twenty-three places of worship in London and its suburbs. In the United Kingdom there are about 196,000 Jews, mainly in London and other large towns. They have 200 synagogues, with about

200 ministers and readers. The Jews support their own poor and raise about £150,000 annually for religious and benevolent purposes. The Mohammedans have a mosque. The Greeks have churches in London, Manchester, and Liverpool; the Armenians possess churches in London and Manchester; and the French, Dutch, Swedes, and Swiss have places of worship in London, Norwich, and Canterbury. The Roman Catholic Church has in the British Empire thirty archiepiscopal and 106 episcopal sees, thirty-four vicariates, and twelve prefectures apostolic. Including two delegates apostolic, seven coadjutors and seven auxiliary bishops, the archbishops and bishops now holding office in the British Empire number 180.

5. Theological Schools.

There are in the British Isles fifty theological schools, divided as follows: Church of England twenty-one, i.e., sixteen theological colleges,—Aberdare (founded in 1892), Cambridge (Ridley Hall, 1881), Chichester (1839), Cuddesdon (1854), Edinburgh (1845), Ely (1876), Isle of Man (Bishop Wilson Theological School, 1897), Leeds Clergy School (1876), Lichfield (1857), Lincoln (1874), Oxford (Wycliffe Hall, 1876, and St. Stephen's House, 1876), St. Aidan's (1846), Highbury (St. John's Hall, University of London, 1863), Salisbury (1861), and Wells (1840)—and five missionary colleges,—St. Augustine's (Canterbury), Islington, Burgh (Lincolnshire), Dorchester (Oxfordshire), and St. Boniface (Warminster). The Methodists have eight colleges, i.e., the Wesleyan Methodists five,—Richmond, Didsbury (Manchester), Headingley (Leeds), Handsworth (Birmingham), and Belfast; the Primitive Methodists and the Free Methodists one each at Manchester; and the Methodist New Connexion one at Ranmoor (Sheffield). The Congregationalists have nine,—New (London, 1696), Western (Bristol, 1752), Yorkshire United (Bradford, 1756), Hampstead (1803), Lancashire (Manchester, 1816), Mansfield (Oxford, 1886), Nottingham (1863), Memorial (Brecon, 1755), and Bangor (1841). The Baptists have seven,—Bristol (1680), Bangor (1862), Rawdon (Yorkshire, 1804), Regent's Park (London, 1810), Pastors' (1856), Manchester (1866), and Cardiff (1807). The Presbyterians have a college at Cambridge (Westminster), the Calvinistic Methodists two at Bala and Aberystwyth, and the Unitarians one at Oxford (Manchester), while an undenominational theological school is located at Carmarthen (founded in 1689).

Bibliography: For the statistics and details concerning the Church of England there are available the annuals: *The Churchman's Annual; The Official Year-Book of the Church; Nye's Illustrated Church Annual; The National Church Almanac*, and *Crockford's Clerical Directory*. For the other communions recourse must be had to the year-books of the separate bodies; to the *Free Church Year Book; The Review of the Churches; The Proceedings of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches; The Nonconformist and Independent* (a weekly, 1881–1900, continued as *The Examiner*, 1900 sqq.). Consult further, besides the literature under England, Church of, and that under the articles on the individual bodies: R. Winslow, *Law Relating to Protestant Nonconformists*, London, 1886; J. G. Rogers, *Church Systems of England in the 19th Century*, ib. 1891; A. S. Dyer, *Comparative Table of English Nonconformity and the English Church*, ib. 1893; H. S. Skeats, *History of the Free Churches of England*, ib. 1894; W. Lloyd, *The Story of Protestant Dissent*, ib. 1899; C. S. Horne, *History of the Free Churches*, ib. 1903; H. R. Haggard, *The Poor and the Land; a Report on the Salvation Army Colonies*, ib. 1905. Consult also *The Statesman's Year Book*.

ENGLISH, JOHN MAHAN: Baptist; b. at Tullytown, Pa., Oct. 20, 1845. He was graduated at Brown University in 1870 and Newton Theological Institution in 1875. He was teacher of Latin in the Connecticut Literary Institute, Suffield, Conn., 1870–72, and of Greek in Denison University, Granville, O., 1874. He was pastor of the First Baptist Church, Gloucester, Mass., 1875–82, and of the Dudley Street Baptist Church, Boston, 1882. Since 1882 he has been professor of homiletics and pastoral theology in Newton Theological Institution, and was also a lecturer in Andover Theological Seminary in 1895–96. Since 1903 he has been president of the Northern Baptist Education Society. He has written *The Christian Academy and the Education of To-Day* (Hartford, Conn., 1892) and *The Present State of the Christian Ministry* (Boston, 1899).

ENGLISH LADIES: Correctly called the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, one of the most important and influential of the later female congregations of the Roman Catholic Church. Its origin goes back to the attempt of Mary Ward (b. at Mulwith, 3 m. s.e. of Ripon, Yorkshire, Jan. 23, 1585; d. at Heworth, now included in the city of York, Jan. 20, 1645), daughter of an English Roman Catholic of Yorkshire, to found a female society after the pattern of the Jesuits (see Jesuits, III). In 1606 she went to St. Omer and joined the Colettines, the severest order of St. Clare, as a lay sister. Dissatisfied with her work and position there, in 1607 she left the convent, with the determination of founding a new community, especially for English women, and successfully established houses at St. Omer and Gravelines in 1607 and 1609. The members concerned themselves chiefly with the education of girls, and were not bound to strict seclusion. In 1611 Miss Ward adopted the rules of the Jesuits, with the necessary changes to adapt them to women. She spent her time in constant travel in England and the Netherlands, and established houses of her order at Spitalfields, London, about 1611, at Liége in 1617, at Cologne and Treves in 1620 and 1621, and at Rome in 1622. The order did not find favor with the clergy, who charged its founder and its members with insubordination. In 1625 Pope Urban VIII. closed its schools, and in 1628 he decided upon its suppression, which was finally accomplished by bull dated Jan. 13, 1630, and promulgated May 21, 1631. To combat the opposition Miss Ward went to Rome twice, the first time in 1622, when she remained there four years, and again in 1629. In 1626 she went to Munich, where the elector, Maximilian I., allowed her to establish a house, and in 1627 the Emperor Ferdinand provided a foundation for her in Vienna. From 1632 to 1637 she was in Rome, and Urban allowed her to establish a new house there. From 1638 to 1642 she lived in London with a few faithful followers, and thenceforth in her native Yorkshire.

Though nominally suppressed, Mary Ward's communities lived on, perhaps not altogether without the tacit consent of high ecclesiastical authority. The company with her at Heworth kept together and about 1650 removed to Paris. In 1669 Frances Bedingfield established a settlement at Hammersmith, and shortly after one at York. The house in Rome was not given up. The Munich house had royal favor and from the end of the sixteenth century was able to plant filiations in South Germany, in Austria, and in the electorate of Mainz. Its eighty-one rules were approved by Pope Clement XI. in 1703; they were essentially those originally drawn up by Mary Ward, although all mention of her, as well as any acknowledgment of a connection with the "Jesuitesses" was carefully avoided both by the pope and the members of the order, who were now called *Instituta Mariæ* or the "Institute of the English Ladies." A tendency to honor the foundress manifested itself within the order a hundred years later, and Benedict XIV by bull of Apr. 9, 1749, forbade to call her "blessed," and emphasized the non-identity of the Institute with all "Jesuitesses." At the same time he settled a controversy between the order and certain South German bishops by placing each house under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese in which it was located, but making the head of the Munich house supreme over the schools and all matters of visitation. In 1840 the supremacy of the Munich house (in 1835 removed three miles from the city to Nymphenburg) was limited to Bavaria. The Congregation received full papal approval from Pius IX. in 1877.

The congregation includes teachers, called "ladies" (*Fräulein*) and lay sisters ("sisters"). Both classes take simple vows for life, from which they may be released by the pope for canonical reasons. The houses are mother-houses and filiations. The members wear a black dress with broad white collar and white bonnet and black veil. Their principal work is education, and the girls educated by them number several millions. They are also occupied with labors for the poor and sick. They are most numerous in Bavaria, but are also strong in Austria, and have a house in Mainz and in York. There are filiations and mission stations in Lombardy, Bucharest, London, the East Indies, and elsewhere. Two Irish societies, the Loreto Sisters (founded at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, in 1822 by Frances Ball) and the Irish Sisters of Charity (founded in Dublin by Mary Frances Aikenhead in 1815, confirmed 1834), differ from the Institute of Mary only in name. The former have houses all over Ireland and in England, America, Australia, and South Africa.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 364 sqq. (where the literature is given, p. 364); lives of Miss Ward, Miss Ball, and Miss Aikenhead in the *Quarterly Series*, vols. xxxv. and lii., xxxiii., and xcvi. respectively—of Miss Ward by Mary E. C. Chambers, ed. H. J. Coleridge, S. J., 2 vols., London, 1882–85, and in *DNB*, Supplement, iii. 506–508; of Miss Ball by H. J. Coleridge, ib. 1881; of Miss Aikenhead by Maria Nethercott, ib. 1897—and of Miss Aikenhead by S. A., with an account of the foundation of the Irish Sisters of Charity, Dublin, 1879, 1882.

ENLIGHTENMENT, THE.

The Movement Characterized (§ 1).
Political Phase (§ 2).
Economic Phase (§ 3).
Religious and Ethical Aspects (§ 4).
The New Knowledge (§ 5).
The New Historical Method (§ 6).
Philosophy of the Period (§ 7).
Literature of the Enlightenment (§ 8).
The German Enlightenment (§ 9).
Practical Results (§ 10).
Its Relation to Theology (§ 11).
Close of the Period (§ 12).

[The Enlightenment is a translation of the German expression *die Aufklärung* (literally "the Clearing Up"). The rendering "the Illumination" is also sometimes used, while not infrequently the German is transferred without translation.] It signifies a phase of historical evolution in Europe which may be characterized as marking the beginning of the modern period of secular culture, in contrast to the theological spirit that constituted the regulating principle of society in the preceding epoch. The Enlightenment must be regarded not as a definite movement aiming at a particular end, but rather as a general transformation of the genius of the times, accompanied by important changes in national and social organization, and the removal of the center of political gravity from the south to the north of Europe. The principles of the Enlightenment are to be met with in the seventeenth century and may be traced further back to the Renaissance; they attained their fullest development in the eighteenth century; they entered on their decay in the nineteenth. Its animating spirit is essentially that of opposition to the supremacy of churchly ideals based on the irreconcilable contradiction between reason and faith, and to the consequent injection of the element of supernaturalism into the practical affairs of life. Its tendency is toward an explanation of the world on the basis of universally valid factors of knowledge and an ordering of life toward universally valid ends, and its most striking characteristics are an unsparing use of critical analysis and a spirit of reforming utilitarianism. To the general and immutable truth of theology it opposes a truth of its own whose sanction it finds in the mind of the individual, and in this rôle of champion against tradition it is subjective, independent, self-confident and optimistic. But though the Enlightenment was thus the first great movement of opposition to theological dualism, it was not the unconditioned product of the spontaneous action of the human reason, but a historic result of definite facts and circumstances. Its method was determined by ancient tradition and the newly arisen sciences; its content, by that part of historic tradition which it chose to regard as the inalienable possession of the individual mind but which in reality represented only truth attained through development; its essential service consisted in the banishment of supernaturalism from history.

1. The Movement Characterized.

The Thirty Years' War (q.v.), ending with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, was followed by a decline of the religious influence and a corresponding rise of secular interests, which now began to

predominate in public affairs and in social life. The animosities between Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist powers gradually disappeared;

2. Political Phase.

the Northern War brought Orthodox Russia into the sphere of European affairs; colonial growth widened the arena of political activity by offering new fields for material development wherein the religious element was of relative unimportance. Diplomacy abandoned the religious view-point and became Machiavellian with the reason of State as its guiding principle. Within the states the ancient pretensions of the Church yielded to the interests of a society that was rapidly being reorganized on the basis of commercialism, militarism, and bureaucracy. Formally, orthodoxy retained its own and established religions prevailed; yet the secular principle determined the attitude of the governments to the Church and toward their subjects. This is the period of Concordats (q.v.), of the persecution of the Jesuits and of territorial church legislation. The theory of sovereignty, fostered by the revival of the Roman law and the Reformation, developed into absolutism, which in turn subordinated Church to State completely, and broke the political influence of creed. With these changes in the conception of the purpose and authority of the State appeared new theories as to its nature and origin. Following out the traditions of Aristotle and Machiavelli, Jean Bodin (d. 1596) advanced a purely rational origin of society and in his *Colloquium heptaplomeres*, widely read in manuscript (ed. Noack, Schwerin, 1857), developed the destructive effects of such a theory on the religious power in the State. But it was Grotius (d. 1645; see GROTIUS, HUGO) who destroyed the scholastic dualism of *lex naturæ* and *lex divina* and found sanction for the law of nature, the law of nations, public law, and natural morality in the human understanding unaided by revelation. His cause was strengthened by the rise of the modern Stoics in Holland and by Hobbes (d. 1679; see HOBBES, THOMAS) with his Epicurean teachings. Pufendorf (d. 1694), in Germany, and Locke (d. 1704), in England (see PUFENDORF, SAMUEL; LOCKE, JOHN), made the new ideas the common possession of European culture. In this newly developed theory of the State is the true precursor of the Enlightenment; for, though it assumed no radical attitude in the beginning and maintained friendly relations with the religious creeds of the time, its result was the destruction of the theological bases of the prevailing culture. It exercised a powerful influence on the remodeling of church law, especially among the Protestants, marking, as it did, the beginning of ecclesiastical legislation on purely political principles. It furthered the growth of tolcration and attained its final development in the theory of the freedom of religion and of conscience, and further still, of the universal rights of man. Yet so complex are the sources of the various manifestations which in their entirety are known as the Enlightenment, that the Declaration of the Rights of Man by the French States-General in 1789 is more immediately to be traced to the influence of the constitution of the United States (1783) than to Roùsseau's *Contrat social* (1762).

Parallel with this process of political transformation went a line of cognate economic and social development. The old rigidity of social organization—the feudal separation of classes—gave way slowly with the development of an extensive world commerce and the rise of industry. The financial needs of the absolute state made it the friend of the rising commercial and

3. Economic Phase.

industrial classes for whose protection laws are now enacted. The growth of economic freedom reacted in turn upon the development of the individual. The natural sciences came to the aid of the rising technical industries, and in this manner an alliance between the industrial and the learned classes was effected. The final result was a fluent intermingling among the different classes of the population, revealing itself in the appearance of a powerful citizen class eager for political, economic, and spiritual liberty, the inheritors of a new literature and a new education that was tending to free itself from theological guardianship. England and Holland were the models of this close union of commercialism and liberty and as changed political conditions had led to the formulation of a new political theory, so the transformation of economic facts in Europe brought forth a new economic and social theory, which, like the new theory of the State, bore a deep impress of the idea of natural rights. Bound up for a time with the theological teaching, it was developed into an independent theory by the English and French bourgeoisie and became, finally, antitheological and, to a degree, antireligious. Its independence was fully established by Adam Smith (d. 1790) and Quesnay (d. 1774). The spirit of individual freedom and courageous optimism appears more prominently in this economic phase than in any other phase of the Enlightenment. Unrestricted freedom of labor and of capital became inalienable human rights, and of all the ideas of the Enlightenment have maintained themselves longest and affected the world most.

Along with political and economic changes there is to be noted a transformation in the general spirit of the age, which arose in reaction against the excesses of religious wars, the

4. Religious and Ethical Aspects.

burden of established creeds, and the ceaseless strife of theologians. Out of religious conflict in England came the Levelers and Latitudinarians (qq.v.), and, in Germany, the Calixtines (see HUSS, JOHN, HUSSITES), together with the many attempts at religious union. A powerful cause contributing to the weakening of the religious influence was the patent inefficiency of established creeds as a force for morality. The rise of Pietism (q.v.) prepared the way for the Enlightenment. There comes a revolt against the belief in magic, witchcraft, and other superstitions. A growing spirit of humaneness, of active philanthropy, and of cosmopolitan tolerance, appears, indicated, for example, in the mitigation of the severity of judicial procedure. The tendency to

find a basis for morality independent of religion gains strength. In England and France societies are organized for the improvement of morals and manners; in the universities the elegance of Cicero and Seneca drives out the old scholasticism; and theological narrowness is combated by the spirit of universalism in the Neo-Stoic teachings of Justus Lipsius (d. 1606), who influenced Grotius, Descartes and Spinoza. The spirit of Humanism and the Renaissance thus persisted in the jurists and the philosophers of France and Holland.

In all these phases of the Enlightenment there appears, as yet, no conscious, thorough hostility to a theology restricted to its own field, but the desire rather to emancipate other branches of human interest from its sway. Only gradually does a really independent method of thought arise, conditioned largely by the epistemological and moral theories of Stoicism. The theory of natural law first established its independence; natural religion and natural morality achieved their freedom with greater difficulty. Yet natural religion, in essence, was taught by theology itself and needed but the refutation of the doctrines of hereditary sin and the invalidity of the human intellect in order to gain the overhand over a revelation. Lord Herbert of Cherbury accomplished this in 1624 in his *De veritate religionis.* Natural morality was freed from theology through the separation of the *lex naturæ* from the *lex divina* and sanction for it in the human reason was established by Francis Bacon (q.v.; d. 1626) and the French skeptics, especially by Charron in his *Sagesse* (1605). Bayle (d. 1705; see BAYLE, PIERRE) contrasted the universality of the moral instinct with the diversity and conflict between historical creeds. In these different ways Western Europe, in the seventeenth century, strove toward the attainment of an autonomous organon that should constitute a simple and unvarying norm for the guidance of the judgment on the matter of conflicting faiths and moral dogmas.

5. The New Knowledge.

On the evolution of such a method of thought a profound influence was exercised by the natural sciences and the method which they employed. Two forces are discernible in this development—(1) the impetus toward induction supplied by Bacon and, more than this, (2) the progress in mathematics and mechanics following the astronomical discoveries of Copernicus (d. 1543), Kepler (d. 1673), and Galileo (d. 1642). The new knowledge united to the atomism of Gassendi (d. 1655) established induction on a firm basis and found fullest expression in Newton (d. 1727), Huyghens (d. 1695) and Laplace (d. 1827). The laws of gravitation and inertia were both the basis and the impulse to extensive investigation in the various phases of the physical world. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are the centuries of the great physicists and mathematicians, and on the principles they outlined arose the sciences of optics, acoustics, chemistry, zoology, geology, physiology, and medicine. The influence of the new sciences was enormous. They destroyed the foundations of revelation and theology, and led to the rise of new philosophic systems aiming at the interpretation and correlation of the results attained by the various sciences, the methods of which were mathematical, marked primarily by clearness of statement and preciseness of definition. The new scientific method entered even the fields of natural law, natural religion, and natural morality. Locke and Condillac made psychology the study of the laws of motion among psychic elements, and Quesnay interpreted social laws after the manner of laws of nature. Voltaire became the apostle of Newton and in France particularly the new sciences were perfected and disseminated. Nor were these in the beginning hostile to religion. The new knowledge showed itself capable of various interpretations. It was found consistent with deism by Locke and Voltaire, with ancient pantheism by Shaftesbury, with mystic pantheism by Spinoza, with spiritualism by Descartes, with theism by Leibnitz, and with materialism by the Encyclopedists (q.v.). Yet the whole aspect of the world of thought was changed. Miracles became impossible, except to the casuist; the earth was removed from its central position in the universe and became only a point in space; anthropocentrism was destroyed. The spirit of the eighteenth century assumed its characteristic qualities; it became atomistic, analytic, mechanical, practical; entirely on the side of the known and the evident, entirely opposed to all that was dark, mystic or fantastic.

6. The New Historical Method.

Second only in importance to the mathematical sciences was the development of a new historical method, universal, secular, and philosophic, as opposed to the theological and antiquarian historiography that came before. The great geographical discoveries of the age made the field of human interest coextensive with the world and fostered the study of history, geography and statistics. Tradition in state, religion, and law were put to the test of critical investigation. Machiavelli and Bodin were followed by the expounders of natural law whose studies lay in the field of politics and legal history, and the Deists who gave their attention to religion. In manifold ways the French skeptics emphasized the relativity of the principles underlying state and religion. This principle of relativity found its most ingenious exposition in Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1696) and its profoundest expression in Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes* (1727). A decisive blow at traditional methods was administered by Bolingbroke's *Letters on the Study and Use of History* (1738–52). Voltaire in his *Essai sur les mœurs et sur l'esprit des nations* (1754–58) opened the succession of histories of civilization and universal histories which established the principle of the relativity of different civilizations and of the possibility of explaining history by natural laws. He was followed by Turgot (d. 1781), Condorcet (d. 1794), Dupuis (d. 1809), and others in France, by Robertson (d. 1793), Gibbon (d. 1794), and Hume (d. 1776) in England, and in Germany by Gatterer (d. 1799), Schlözer (d. 1809), Heeren (d. 1842), Meiners (d 1810), J. D. Michaelis (d. 1791), and Spittler (d.

1810). If the age of the Enlightenment be called an unhistorical age, it is so only in the sense that it cultivated history not so much as an end in itself as for the purpose of obtaining support for its political and moral theories. And the influence of its investigations was enormous. They destroyed the idea of a history of the world based on Daniel, the Apocalypse, and St. Augustine, opened up vast realms of time, rejected the fall of man as the cardinal point in universal evolution, and created a new type of primitive man. Above all, it introduced a method analogous to the analytical and mechanical method of the natural sciences. It dealt with the individual as the historical unit, as a result of whose conscious, purposive actions social structures arise. And as the enormous diversity of human motive and impulse thus revealed necessitated the establishment of some norm for a unified interpretation of history, such a one was found in natural law, religion, and morality; and all deviations from the norm were ascribed to evil or cunning, to tyranny or priestly hypocrisy, to stupidity or ignorance. And thus historiography, because it had caught the spirit of the Enlightenment, became a powerful instrument for the dissemination of that spirit, though in the first place works may have been written with purposes deistic or materialistic, theological or anticlerical, skeptical or optimistic.

7. Philosophy of the Period.

A new philosophy, opposed both to the Aristotelianism of the Church and to the rehabilitation of ancient philosophic systems, now assumes to outline the fundamental principles of scientific thought in the theoretical and practical disciplines. Abandoning the old belief in the Fall and the consequent degeneration of the human intellect, it grounded itself on the capacities of the human mind and dared to be as creative in basic principles as the new sciences had been in their respective fields. Philosophy was no longer the handmaid of theology, but ruled an independent realm. The creation of a new philosophy was the work of the great minds of the seventeenth century; its consequences partly destroyed theology and partly transformed it. These consequences were developed in the eighteenth century by the less original thinkers and littérateurs; for though the great men of the eighteenth century, Hume, Berkeley, Kant, belonged in part to the Enlightenment, their original work first bore fruit in the nineteenth. Yet the influence exercised by the great philosophers on the history of philosophy is different from that they exerted on the history of the Enlightenment. Their essentially philosophic problems were too abstruse and subtle to affect greatly a popular movement, and it was rather their secondary contributions that furthered the progress of the Enlightenment. Thus Spinoza and Malebranche exercised practically no influence at all; the influence exercised by Hobbes and Leibnitz was indirect; while that of Shaftesbury and others was only partial. Of greater importance, after Descartes, was the work of Bayle, Locke, Wolff, Voltaire, and the Encyclopedists. Service was also rendered by the Deists who directed their criticism against positive religion, and the ethical writers who sought in the new philosophy a basis for natural morality. There came finally the real philosophers of the Enlightenment, the eclectics and popularizers, the exponents of common sense and natural law, whose philosophical importance is small indeed, but whose historical influence was great.

Nevertheless the philosophy of the Enlightenment, in the last analysis, may be traced back to the great philosophic systems. (1) Cartesianism applied the mechanical method to the study of the physical world and the axiomatic process of mathematics to the spiritual. It found ontologic unity in a God who combined in himself physical substance and soul substance. It abandoned everything that was not clear or demonstrable. (2) The sensualism of Hobbes and Locke broke more abruptly with the old metaphysics by discarding self-evident truths and innate ideas and founding all knowledge on the experience of the senses, and its recasting in the soul; yet they found the idea of God necessary for the working of their world machine. From them proceeded the physico-theological arguments for the wisdom and the goodness of an architectonic deity and the treatment of morality on the basis of an empirical psychology whieh attained to the greatest importance. (3) In reaction against sensualism, Leibnitz, by a method analogous to that of Descartes, established a mechanical world of bodies and a dynamic world of spirits, transforming the old ontology of substances into one of monads. (4) Materialism carried the tenets of sensualism to the extreme by denying the existence of the soul and combating the physico-theological arguments for the existence of God. In Hume and Kant, it is true, the materialism of the new natural philosophy brought forth profound epistemological theories, but the natural sciences on the whole rendered greater services to the revolutionary thought, which attempted, on the basis of the observation of nature and certain elementary data of psychology empirically derived, to create a new metaphysical and ethical system, destined to constitute the precondition for a complete reconstruction of society. Yet to all these contrasting or opposed systems there were common the spirit of antagonism to the theological method, the miraculous and the exceptional, and an undoubting confidence in the power of the intellect to attain knowledge and in power of will to apply it. Especially in the field of ethics the independence of the human conscience was upheld against all supernatural authority, against all revealed systems of sanctions, rewards, and punishments.

It was literature, however, and not philosophy, that really insured the triumph of the Enlightenment. The great fact here to be recognized is the cooperation of three forces, a rising bourgeoisie, a growing independence of thought, and the highly developed literatures of England and France. It was literature that finally overthrew theology and created the vocabulary, the battle-cries and the very name of the Enlightenment. Holland was the first home of the militant literature of the age.

There Bayle published his dictionary and edited his journal (*Nouvelles de la républiques des lettres*, 1684–87), and Le Clerc published his *Bibliothèque universelle* (1686–1726).

8. Literature of the Enlightenment.

The real origin of the literature of the Enlightenment, however, was in England after the Whig Revolution and the establishment of the freedom of the press in 1693. Locke (d. 1704) and Shaftesbury (d. 1713) were writers of elegance. Pope's *Essay on Man* (1733) is a theodicy in the spirit of Shaftesbury. The publication of periodicals dealing with contemporary manners and morals prepared the way for the realistic study of life which Fielding (d. 1754), Smollett (d. 1771), Goldsmith (d. 1774), and Sterne (d. 1768) were to carry on with splendid psychological power and absolute freedom from theological predispositions. Defoe (d. 1731) pictured man in a state of nature, and exercised a profound influence on Rousseau and German pedagogy. Bolingbroke (d. 1751) was the first to write philosophic history. The moral theories of the Deists were expounded by Hutcheson (d. 1747), Ferguson (d. 1816), Adam Smith (d. 1790), Wollaston (d. 1724), Price (d. 1791), and Tucker (d. 1799), and the esthetic theories of Shaftesbury were developed by Burke (d. 1797), Gerard (d. 1795), and Hume (d. 1776) who studied the relations between the beautiful and the useful and greatly influenced the German Enlightenment. Richardson's (d. 1761) novels of middle class sentimentality and morals produced an important effect on Voltaire, Diderot, Klopstock, Lessing, and Wieland. The Enlightenment literature in England was not radical, however; extremists, like Toland (d. 1722) among Deists, exercised no great influence, while materialism found in Hartley (d. 1757) and Priestley (d. 1804) only solitary champions. The decline of the Enlightenment in England may be dated from the reaction following the outbreak of the French Revolution.

In France the Enlightenment first gained strength among the dilettante nobility of the court of Louis XIV from whom it passed to the members of the higher bourgeoisie and the literary class, and then to the great mass of the Third Estate. From the classic literature which it found ready to its hand it derived precision, elegance, and wit, but also something of the shallowness that goes with these qualities. Newton and Locke were introduced to the French public by Maupertuis (d. 1759) and D'Argenson (d. 1757). The novel and drama of English citizen life were copied by Prévost (d. 1763) and Destouches (d. 1754). But the highest development of the Enlightenment literature came toward the middle of the century when in a spirit of extreme radicalism it assailed everything in society, Church, and State. The exponents of the Enlightenment may be divided into three groups which differed appreciably in character and succeeded each other in prominence, though united in aim. (1) English liberalism and deism were advocated with remarkable success by Voltaire (d. 1778) in almost every literary form; his interests were predominantly religious. Montesquieu (d. 1753) gave his time to history and politics and became the father of pragmatic history and constitutionalism. (2) The succeeding scientific and materialistic movement was originated by La Mettrie (d. 1751), found its most celebrated exponent in Diderot (d. 1784), and its classic formulation in the "Encyclopedia" (1751–80). More purely scientific were Holbach (*Système de la nature*, 1770), Condillac (d. 1780) and his theories of knowledge, Cabanis (d. 1808), and Buffon (d. 1788), whose literary charm made him one of the most influential of popularizers of science. (3) A new spirit and tone appears in Rousseau (d. 1778) who expressed the economic theories of the Enlightenment in their deepest and most abstract form and on the other hand lent to its cold intelligence a romantic warmth and a depth of feeling that widened immensely its range of appeal. Through Mirabeau and Sieyès the ideas of the Enlightenment entered the Revolution.

From England and France the elements of the Enlightenment came to Germany, where, owing to peculiar conditions, its political manifestations were of far less importance than its influence in the fields of religion, ethics and esthetics. Two distinct literary movements marked the eighteenth century: (1) The real literature of the Enlightenment proceeded from the popularized teachings of Leibnitz, through Wolff and Gottsched, and developed on the one hand into theological and legal rationalism, and on the other into the novel and play of middle class morals. (2) The revived humanistic or classic-romantic movement, proceeding from English sources and from the more essential teachings of Leibnitz, passed through Lessing to Herder, Winckelmann, Goethe, Schiller, and Humboldt and found expression also in the newer schools of philosophy and the historical and psychological sciences. Leibnitz, Lessing, and Kant belong to both movements; to the Enlightenment, through their practical interests and the results of their popularized teachings; to the second, through the deep and original content of their philosophy which was appreciated only by the minority. Only the former movement is here to be considered, a movement through which Germany assumed its place in the literary world, last, because the theological influence had longest maintained itself in the small German principalities, because science was still subject to scholasticism, and finally because of peculiar political conditions. The first change to be noticed occurred in the sphere of learning where Pufendorf (d. 1694) and Leibnitz (d. 1716) ushered in a broad, cosmopolitan treatment of the sciences. The first to gain a wide hearing for the new ideas was Thomasius (d. 1728), who sought to reorganize education after the French model and in 1688 established a periodical similar to those published in Holland at the time. Wolff (d. 1754) slowly drove scholasticism from the universities. The real founders of the literature of the German Enlightenment, however, were Gottsched (d. 1766) who combined the Wolffian philosophy with French classicism and translated Bayle, and Gellert (d. 1769) who, writing under

9. The German Enlightenment.

English influences, in poems, lectures, fables, and novels, laid the basis for the moral culture of Germany for many decades. There appeared also imitations of the English periodicals (after 1721) which, though largely theological in tone, continued the connection between literature and the bourgeoisie and sang of the justness of God after the manner of Pope and Thomson. How all-pervading the theological atmosphere was appears in Klopstock (d. 1803) and his imitators, though it is indeed a softened theology expressed in humanistic and poetic form. The break with theology was initiated by Lessing (d. 1781), who found the step essential in his endeavor to create a new culture and a new literature upon the basis of a new attitude toward life. In revelation Lessing discerned only a manifestation of the human mind striving toward truth, which is attainable only by reason, and this theory he elaborated with the assistance of deistic theologians like Spalding (d. 1804) and Jerusalem (d. 1789). At Berlin arose the group under Nicolai (d. 1811) and Mendelssohn (d. 1786). Their organ was the *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*, around which sprang up a group of popular philosophers who promulgated theories of natural morals, theology, and esthetics on the basis of Locke, Leibnitz, and Wolff. Wieland (d. 1813) in his philosophical romances contrasted the light French view of life with the heavy idealism of the Germans and thus gained over the Gallicized higher classes to the use of the German tongue. Of the other great figures of literature only the youthful Schiller (d. 1805) had connection with the Enlightenment. Kant (d. 1804), in his practical philosophy, in his morals, law and theology, approached the Enlightenment and lent to its ideas a more formal character. But while Goethe (d. 1832) and Schiller had little to do with the movement, the favor of the public went out to Iffland, Kotzebue and the charm of Jean Paul.

10. Practical Results.

So mighty a development as the Enlightenment could not fail to produce a profound effect on the practical affairs of life. Its double result was (1) to strengthen the bourgeoisie and inspire them to demand a share in government and administration and (2) to drive the governments themselves to concession. In England and France the first movement made itself predominant; in the rest of Europe the second was the more conspicuous. Philosophic kings and ministers now appear of the type of Frederick II. of Prussia, and the espousal of the ideas of reform by the monarchs led in turn to the complete triumph of such ideas. The French Revolution came because the French government lacked the courage and decision to adopt the new ideas. After the Revolution the ideas persisted and in the subsequent political reorganization played a prominent part.

In the spiritual realm the most important effects of the Enlightenment appeared in the fields of education and public instruction. Universities were freed from the sway of the old theological humanism, citizens' schools and popular schools were established or reorganized, and public instruction was freed from clerical supervision. Other influences like Pietism tended toward the same result, but it was from the Enlightenment that the inspiration came toward the creation of an educational system that, with the supreme confidence of the period, was expected to lead to a higher, happier, more prosperous, and more moral age. The great educational programs of the age emanated from Locke (*Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, 1693) and Rousseau (*Émile*, 1762), the one outlining the education of a man of the world through experience and reflection, the other the development of man through the unrestrained unfolding of natural powers. The *Émile*, in France, was only a success of the hour, but in Germany it gave the impetus to the great philanthropinistic movement. Basedow (*Methodenbuch für Väter und Mütter der Familien und Völker*, 1770) was followed by Bahrdt, Rochow, Campe, Stuve, and others. Through Zedlitz, minister of Frederick II., the new ideas shaped the policy of the Prussian government. But as early as the middle of the seventeenth century, the needs of the bureaucracy and the nobility had led to the erection of institutions intended to furnish a new education, not Greek and theological, but modern and practical. Halle (1694) was the type of the new institutions and it influenced greatly the development of philosophic and juristic studies. By the middle of the eighteenth century the theological education had suffered a further loss of prestige as indicated in the erection of the University of Göttingen (1736), where humanism is found independent of theology. The *Volksschule* created by Pietism fell ultimately under the sway of the ideas of the Enlightenment, and even Pestalozzi recognized them in part.

11. Its Relation to Theology.

Of the influence exerted by theology on the progress of the Enlightenment mention has already been made; it was an influence exerted, however, under compulsion and it advanced the interests of the Enlightenment without adding anything to its content. As a result of the subjection in which the Enlightenment was held by theology for a long time and the necessity for violent action on the part of the latter to achieve its independence, it assumed that negative and destructive character by which it was so strongly marked. Even in its affirmative theories the Enlightenment, in its struggles with theology, was brought to assume the existence of as rigid a truth as that of its rival. The break between the two was sharpest in France where the unyielding attitude of the Church made the Enlightenment perforce a movement of thorough negation. In England and Germany, on the contrary, there was a *rapprochement* between the two. In the former country there arose out of the deistic controversy an apologetic theology (Clarke, Butler, Warburton, and Paley) which may be designated as rational supernaturalism, which here as well as in Germany carried the spirit of the Enlightenment into the very heart of the enemy's position. In Germany, especially, the course of the development was decided by a compromise between Enlightenment and theology which was effectual in disseminating the principles of the former, not only among the

learned classes, but among the great masses of the population. But as its principles were embraced by members of the higher clergy and by the theological faculties, it became in turn conservative. Slowly, however, the inherent contradiction between its principles and the theological dualism of reason and revelation came to the front. With time the germ of dissolution entered into the body of dogma and the new spirit of the times attacked both the logical substructure and the imposed superstructure of doctrine. The followers of Wolff had attempted a compromise without departing from the paths of orthodoxy, but the Neologues, under the influence of the popular philosophy, broke entirely with dogma and sought to restrict revelation to the Bible, whose contents seemed more in harmony with natural theology than the scholastic subtleties of the Church. Only at the end of the century, however, and primarily under the inspiration of Kant's *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft* (1793) did the more radical theologians advance to the position of identifying completely the religion of ethical rationalism with Biblical revelation, though still with purely apologetic purposes. But through this apologetic literature the subjective, analytic, and utilitarian spirit of the Enlightenment penetrated to the very heart of Christian belief, and inevitably led to reactionary movements which made common cause with other forms of reaction aroused by the spirit of the Enlightenment. The theology of the Enlightenment was, therefore, a thoroughly apologetic compromise on the basis of the principles of the Enlightenment. It was a question of the supremacy of the dogma of reason, of the dogma of revelation, or of the identification of the two, and it was the last solution that theology was driven to adopt.

The end of the period of the Enlightenment began in different countries at different times. The mightiest influences that contributed toward its downfall were the political reactions aroused in England by the American Revolution and that in Europe by the French Revolution. At the same time the revolutionary movement finally destroyed the political structure of the medieval ages and cleared the ground for a new political and social organization. The wars of the Revolution called into being a new factor, the principle of nationality, which came into opposition both with the spirit of enlightened cosmopolitanism and with the spirit of enlightened absolutism of the preceding period. There entered into play at the same time the influence of the new German culture which emancipated itself from the ideas of the Enlightenment in literature, philosophy, and science, created a new attitude toward life, and soon came to cooperate with similar tendencies in other countries. Fancy and sentiment, a love for the humane culture, sympathy for all that is psychologically real, characterized this new conception of life which was at one with the Enlightenment in its opposition to supernaturalism, but differed from it in its positive appreciation of the worth of things. Science, too, lost its character of abstract subjectivism and militant reform, and restricted itself to the interpretation of reality. Finally reaction entered also the field of economic thought, destroying the individualistic principles of the Enlightenment. Nevertheless the Enlightenment has remained an appreciable influence to the present day, to a minor degree in Germany, to an important extent in France and the Anglo-Saxon world, where the separation between Enlightenment and supernaturalism is as sharp as it was a century ago. (E. TROELTSCH.)

12. Close of the Period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. B. Pusey, *Historical Enquiry into the Rationalist Character . in the Theology of Germany*, London, 1828; B. Bauer, *Geschichte der Politik, Kultur und Aufklärung des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Charlottenburg, 1843–44; F. A. Saintes, *Critical History of Rationalism in Germany*, London, 1849; L. Noack, *Freidenker in der Religion*, Bern, 1853–55; A. F. Gfrörer, *Geschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Schaffhausen, 1862–84; F. C. Schlosser, *Geschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, 8 vols., Heidelberg, 1856–1864; K. R. Hagenbach, *German Rationalism in its Rise, Progress and Decline*, Edinburgh, 1865; H. T. Buckle, *Hist. of Civilization in England*, London, 1878 (cf. L. Étienne, *Le Positivisme dans l'histoire*, Paris, 1868, a criticism of Buckle); J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology in England in 17th Century*, Edinburgh, 1872; Kohn, *Aufklärungsperiode*, Potsdam, 1873; J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Conflict between Religion and Science*, New York, 1874; idem, *Hist. of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, 2 vols., ib., 1876; J. Cairns, *Unbelief in 18th Century*, London, 1881; L. Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in 18th Century*, ib., 1881; A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la révolution*, Paris, 1885–92; R. Eucken, *Grundbegriffe der Gegenwart*, Leipsic, 1893; A. D. White, *Hist. of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, New York, 1896; W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, London, 1899; J. F. Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, New York, 1901; R. Otto, *Naturalistische und religiöse Weltansicht*, Tübingen, 1904, Eng. transl., *Naturalism and Religion*, New York, 1907.

ENNODIUS, MAGNUS FELIX: Latin author and bishop of Padua; b. at Arles 473 or 474; d. at Padua July 17, 521. His life, until he reached manhood, was secular, and his education was classical. After becoming a convert to Christianity, he delayed making an open profession of faith until attacked by serious illness. With his wife's consent, he separated from her to enter the religious life, and was ordained deacon by Epiphanius of Ticinum at some date previous to 494. In 496 Ennodius went to Milan, where he took an active part in the schism which then convulsed the Church (see ANASTASIUS II.). In connection with this arose the controversy of Pope Symmachus with the antipope Laurentius (see SYMMACHUS), in the course of which Ennodius defended the pope in his *Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere præsumpserunt*, basing the papal power on the privileges of Peter. Remaining at Milan as deacon until 512, he was appointed bishop of Padua in 514. He had already accompanied his predecessor on a mission of Theodoric to the Burgundian king Gundobad, and in 515 and 517 he was sent by Pope Hormisdas to the court of the Byzantine emperor Anastasius in an unsuccessful endeavor to reconcile the Eastern and the Western Churches.

As an author Ennodius represents Latin literature in its period of decline. In theology he was a Semi-Pelagian, and made no attempt to conceal his antipathy to Augustine. In addition to the works already noted, special mention may be

made of his numerous, but unimportant, letters, the *Vita Epiphanii episcopi Ticini* (valuable for its biography of his predecessor), the *Vita beati Antonii* (very legendary, in the taste of the period), the *Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theodorico*, the *Eucharisticum de vita* (autobiographical), and many *dictiones* on subjects of minor interest. (T. FÖRSTER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The works of Ennodius, except the *Carmina*, are in *MPL*, lxiii. The *Carmina*, *Epistolæ*, and *Panegyricus*, ed. F. Vogel, are in *MGH*, *Auct. ant.*, vol. vii., 1885. A list of editions and literature is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 407–408, 1291, with which cf. Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 47, 70, 404, ii. 480, i (1893), 48, 72. Consult: Fertig, *Magnus Felix Ennodius und seine Zeit*, Passau, 1855–60; F. Piper, in *ZKG*, i (1877), 239–256; B. Hasenstab, *Studien zu Ennodius*, Munich, 1890; S. Léglise, *S. Ennodius et la suprématie au 6. siècle*, Lyons, 1890; W Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii. 19–20; *DCB*, ii. 123–124.

ENOCH.

The Source of Knowledge (§ 1). Similar Legends (§ 3).
Life and Translation (§ 2). Enoch in Tradition (§ 4).

Enoch is the name in the Hebrew text of the eldest son of Reuben (Gen. xlvi. 9; Ex. vi. 14); a son of Midian (Gen. xxv. 4); a son of Cain (Gen. iv. 17–18) after whom the latter named the first city; and, in the line of Seth, of the seventh patriarch as reckoned from Adam (Gen. v. 18). Since the name Lamech also occurs in the lines of both Cain and Seth, and as there is a striking similarity between other names of the two lines, it has been customary since Buttmann (*Mythologus*, i., Berlin, 1828, pp. 170 sqq.) to regard the two genealogies of Gen. iv. and v. (which furthermore belong to different sources, J and P) as variants of a single account. The resemblance becomes still closer if it be assumed that in Gen. v. Enoch and Mahalalel (= Mehujael of Gen. iv.) have become transposed. Also a relation with the list of the ten primitive Babylonian kings in Berosus can not be denied. Enoch there has his parallel in the seventh king, Enmeduranki, in the sun-city Sippara. That Enoch also stands in some relation to the sun, is indicated by the 365 years of his life.

1. The Source of Knowledge.

This patriarch, in Gen. v., has a thoroughly ethical distinction; "he walked with God" (cf. Noah, Gen. vi. 9). This indicates a constant community of life, an undisturbed, familiar intercourse with God. Herewith is intimately connected the most momentous matter that is still extant about Enoch in the ancient source. After a comparatively brief term of life, 365 years, "he was not; for God took him." Obviously something extraordinary is thus recorded. Enoch had suddenly vanished, was no more seen. The expression corresponds to the one used in a similar connection by Livy (i. 16) of Romulus, "he was not thenceforth on earth"; the event itself, to the seeking after vanished Elijah (II Kings ii. 16–17). But the reason is not indefinite; God intervened contrary to the usual course of nature and removed his favored one from the world of appearances. Except for this extraordinary case, an early departure from life was considered a token of divine disfavor.

2. Life and Translation.

Comparisons have been adduced with heathen myths and legends, which relate of the translation of illustrious men (Hercules, Romulus, etc.). But the brief mysterious Biblical notice is essentially different in that here the ethical community of life on earth with God (the "faith" of Heb. xi. 5) is the manifest reason for the "taking" to God; whereas the legends are based on a physical conception of divinity, whereby the same coalesces with the highest product of nature. There is a parallel in the translation of Xisuthros in Berosus, inasmuch as this devout worthy after the Flood is translated to the gods as reward for his piety. But this hero corresponds to the Biblical Noah. While here an account is extant which is independent of the Biblical narrative but akin to it, on the other hand the legend adduced by E. Bochart (in *Phaleg et Canaan*, Caen, 1646), with reference to the ancient king Annakos or Nannakos in the city of Iconium, is questionable on the score of originality. This king is said to have lived upward of 300 years before Deucalion's flood; he is supposed to have predicted the same, and to have tearfully bewailed the lot of men, since after his death they were to be overtaken with destruction. The story is first found in Zenobius (*Proverbia*, vi. 10), that is, about 200 A.D.; Jewish influence is not improbable.

3. Similar Legends.

Concerning the manner of the translation, and the abode and condition of Enoch after it, which the theologians have sought to define more closely, the Bible gives no clue. The context merely stands for the fact that he was taken away from the world of sin and death, and received into closer communion with God, without dying. The view prevalent with the rabbis and in the primitive Church, designates Paradise as his place of abode; others indicate heaven; the Ascension of Isaiah (ix. 9), the seventh heaven. The Arab theologians waver according to the indefinite expression of the Koran xix. 58 (cf. the Book of Enoch lxxxvii. 3). The New Testament also recognizes a transformation without death (I Thess. iv. 17; I Cor. xv. 51).

4. Enoch in Tradition.

Tradition has been all the busier for the meagerness of actual data. By analogy with Noah, it was assumed that Enoch was a preacher of repentance and herald of judgment. (Ecclus. xliv. 16; cf. xlix. 14; Book of Enoch i. 9; Jude 14 sqq.). Later, in an age of speculation concerning nature and history, people thought to find in Enoch conversing so intimately with God the actual first vehicle of divinely influenced human discernment, the genuine *gnosis* instilled by good spirits, in contradistinction to the knowledge conveyed by demons. His name (from the Heb. *ḥanakh*, "to consecrate") seemed to denote the "consecrated" one, from whom authentic solutions were to be expected touching the secrets of this world and the one beyond. Hence he was esteemed no less as the inventor of writing and the sciences, especially starcraft (Eusebius, *Præparatio evangelica*, ix. 17; cf. the number 365), than as apocalyptic

seer (cf. A. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, Leipsic, 1853, pp. xxvi. sqq.). In the last centuries before Christ, Enoch was accredited with the entire treasure of contemporary knowledge about God, nature, and history; as was done in the theologically important Book of Enoch (see PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, II., 4–5). With the Arabs, Enoch, or, as they more commonly call him, Idris (" the learned, expert one ") plays predominantly the part of the mediator of higher wisdom and science (cf. d'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque orientale*, Germ. transl., i., Halle, 1785, pp. 624–625; G. Weil, *Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner*, Frankfort, 1845, pp. 62–67); for rabbinic legends cf. J. A. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii., Königsberg, 1711, pp. 396 sqq.).

C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the literature given in the text, consult: H. Polano, *Selections from the Talmud*, pp. 34–37, Philadelphia, 1876; H. E. Ryle, *Early Narratives of Genesis*, pp. 90–91, London, 1892; idem, in *Expository Times*, iii. (1892) 355; *DB*, i. 704–705; *EB*, ii. 1294–96; *JE*, v. 178–179; and Commentaries on Genesis and on Jude.

ENTHRONIZATION. See BISHOP; POPE, PAPACY, PAPAL SYSTEM.

ENTHUSIASM: An intense moral impulse or all-engrossing temper of mind. The term as applied to religion designates both a noble temper of mind and moral fervor, and also a misdirected and even destructive intensity of feeling. In the better sense of the term, our Lord was the highest illustration of enthusiasm. His soul was possessed with overwhelming affection for men, and an intense impulse to help them. The apostles were enthusiasts in a good sense. The early monks, St. Francis of Assisi, Dominic, Huss, the Reformers, the early Methodists, are all examples of religious enthusiasm. Heathen religions have had their enthusiasts as well as the Christian.

Christian enthusiasm in the good sense is derived from two motives,—love for men and love for Christ. In the bad sense, enthusiasm is almost synonymous with fanaticism, and enthusiasts with zealots. It is fervor of soul drawn from wrong principles, founded on wrong judgments, and applied to wrong ends. Neither selfish nor impure motives necessarily prevail in such a temper of mind, and zeal of activity. Such enthusiasm may proceed from a sincere desire to glorify God. It substitutes fancies for the truth, and in its last stages the disorder of the mind becomes mental insanity.

The term " enthusiasts " has also had a technical sense, as in the Elizabethan period. Jewel, Rogers (*Thirty-nine Articles*, Parker Society ed., Cambridge, 1854, p. 158), and others speak of " Enthusiasts " as they do of Anabaptists. During the Commonwealth period, and afterward the term was frequently applied to the Puritans in a tone of depreciation, as by Robert South, who preached a special sermon on the subject, " Enthusiasts not Led by the Spirit of God," meaning by " enthusiasts " the Puritans. See ECSTASY. (*Sermons*, ed. W. G. T. Shedd, sermons lv. lvi, vol. iii., pp. 157–190, 5 vols., New York, 1866–1871.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: I. Taylor, *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, New York, 1849; G. Lavington, *Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists*, ed. R. Polwhele, London, 1833; J. Mackintosh, *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 731, ib. 1851; C. Wesley's *Sermon on Enthusiasm* is in his *Works*, ii. 331 sqq.

ENZINAS, FRANCISCO DE: Spanish Protestant; b. at Burgos, Spain, c. 1520; d. at Geneva 1570. He was known in Germany by the Grecized form of his name, Dryander, and by the name Eichmann, in France as Duchesne, in Holland as Van Eyck—all translations of his Spanish name, which means " oakman." He studied in the Netherlands and embraced the Reformation; then visited Wittenberg, where he translated the New Testament from the Greek into Spanish under the eye of Melanchthon. His completed work he took to the Netherlands and published it there (Antwerp, 1543). He dedicated it to Charles V. and presented it in person to the emperor at Brussels. But this procedure was so evidently in the interest of the Reformation in Spain that it could not be permitted to pass unpunished, consequently Enzinas was soon after thrown into prison. He escaped in 1545, and thereafter lived in different places. His brother, **Jaime,** also embraced Protestantism, prepared a catechism in Spanish setting forth the Evangelical faith, and printed it at Antwerp (1545). He then, in pursuance of his father's directions, went to Rome, where he was burned at the stake, 1546. The third brother, **Juan,** also became a Protestant, but, settling in Germany, escaped persecution. See SPAIN, THE REFORMATION IN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Mémoires de Francisco de Enzinas*, 2 vols., Brussels, 1862–63, cf. *ZKG*, xiii. (1892); T. McCrie, *Hist. of . . the Reformation in Spain*, chap. v., Edinburgh, 1829; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, iii. 424, New York, 1907; *KL*, iv. 661–662.

EON. See GNOSTICISM.

ÉON DE L'ÉTOILE. See EUDO DE STELLA.

EPAO, SYNOD OF: A synod held in Sept., 517, at Epao or Epaone, a village to the south of Vienne, near the present Anneyron, at that time part of the kingdom of Burgundy, where a year earlier the Arian king Gundobad had been succeeded by his orthodox son Sigismund. It was attended by twenty-four bishops from all parts of the kingdom, on the invitation of Avitus of Vienne (q.v.). Laymen seem to have been present, after their participation had been declared lawful; canon xxiv. permitted them to bring charges against any clergy who were justly accused of immorality. The forty canons passed at this meeting should be considered in connection with those of the synods of Agde (506) and Orléans (511; qq.v.). They were intended to do for the Burgundian kingdom what these had done for the Visigothic or Frankish—though the speedy dissolution of the former made their effect slight. Several of them, however, were included in a later (Spanish) collection of the canons of Agde (though with some modifications in the direction of less severity), and thus continued to have an influence on subsequent practise. The spirit of Avitus breathes through them all. An important section deals with the inalienability of ecclesiastical property; a more

vigorous repression of Arianism is demanded, though the return of individuals to the Church is made easy. It appears that priests and deacons were married, and that the episcopal oversight embraced the monasteries. The enforcement of the rights of bishops corresponds to the treatment of the metropolitan power. The number of forbidden degrees for marriage is increased, in harmony with older legislation, apparently with an eye to the case of a royal official who had married his deceased wife's sister; this led to an attempt on the king's part to discipline the bishops, and to a firm pronouncement on their part at the first Synod of Lyons (before 523), at which eleven of the members of the Synod of Epao were present.

(EDGAR HENNEKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Acta*, ed. R. Peiper, are in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, vi. 2 (1883), 165–175, cf. (ed. Maassen) *MGH, Concil.*, i (1893), 15 sqq.; Harduin, *Concilia*, ii. 1045 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 680 sqq., Eng. transl., iv. 107 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 191, iii. 5, 100.

EPARCHY: Originally the designation of a civil province in the Roman empire, composed of smaller communities, and forming in its turn a subdivision of the *dioikēsis* (see BISHOPRIC). These divisions furnished a model for the ecclesiastical organization; the heads of the smaller communities became bishops, those of the eparchies metropolitans, with their sees in the capital cities, and those of the dioceses exarchs or patriarchs. In the later Greek and Russian Churches, the usage altered and the jurisdiction of an ordinary bishop was called an eparchy. (P HINSCHIUS†.)

EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO THE. See PAUL THE APOSTLE.

EPHESUS. See ASIA MINOR IN THE APOSTOLIC TIME, IV. For the Council of Ephesus, 431 (Third Ecumenical) see NESTORIUS; for the "Robber Synod" of 449, see EUTYCHIANISM, § 6.

EPHOD: An implement used by the priests of the Hebrews to obtain oracles from God. In I Sam. xiv. the Urim and Thummim appear as an accessory of the ephod, especially if (as is probably the case) the Septuagint in verse 41 has the right reading: "Yahweh, thou God of Israel, wherefore answerest thou not thy servant this day? If the guilt be mine or my son Jonathan's, let Urim come forth; if it be the people's, let Thummim come forth." Clearly the Urim and Thummim were two holy lots which were in some close connection with the ephod, and were brought forth by the priest (who put his hand into the bag in which they were kept), or were made to leap out by violent shaking of the bag. From the two passages I Sam. xiv. 41, xxviii. 6 it is evident that in the time of Samuel, Saul, and David it was customary to inquire of God by means of the Urim and Thummim, or, which amounts to the same thing, by the ephod; and further, from I Sam. xiv. 3, 18 (R. V., margin), that it was a part of the high priest's duty to carry it with him. The form of the ephod does not appear from these passages. It is doubtless the same thing which appears in I Sam. xxi. 9, where the sword of Goliath is placed behind it (doubtless as a sacred trophy), in all probability as it hung upon the wall; but this last passage gives no warrant for concluding that it was an image of Yahweh. Besides this ephod which the high priest wore, there is mention of an ephod of linen worn by other priests (I Sam. xxii. 18), by Samuel (I Sam. ii. 18), and by David (II Sam. vi. 14). The ephod to which the Urim and Thummim belonged was therefore not of linen, but probably of some costlier stuff. An ephod which belonged to the high priest's equipment is described Ex. xxv. 7, xxviii. 4, etc.; but it can not be said that this is something entirely different from that which appears in the early accounts. Taken altogether, the references contained in the Old Testament do not permit a very lucid account to be given of the article.

Varieties of Ephod.

According to Ex. xxviii., the ephod was made of gold, blue, purple, and fine linen, joined with two shoulder pieces and a band. It was apparently an ornament for the breast and had a loose "pocket" (*ḥoshen*, a word which is not understood) in which were the Urim and Thummim. This pocket, a span square, was made fast to the ephod by rings of gold and chains which were carried to rosettes on the shoulders, the rings being underneath the ephod. The "pocket" was adorned with three rows of precious stones, four in a row, on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes. The ephod, which was rather of the nature of regalia than of ordinary clothing, was worn above an overcoat of blue (cf. I Sam. ii. 18–19). So far the ephod of the time of Samuel was like that described in the priest-code.

High-Priestly Ephod.

But it is held that numerous signs indicate another kind of ephod. From Judges viii. 24 it is concluded that the ephod was sometimes an image of deity, since in this case it is stated that the thing became a snare to Gideon and to Israel. Those who support this view see confirmation in Judges xvii.–xviii.; I Sam. xxi. 10, and in the connection between ephod and teraphim in Hos. iii. 4. But this view is untenable. That the teraphim were images is clear from I Sam. xix. 13, 16; but it does not follow from the "and" in Hos. iii. 4 that the ephod was also an image. What the two had in common was that both were used as oracles (Ezek. xxi. 21; Zech. x. 2). Judges xviii. 20 speaks against the similarity of ephod and image, and suits better the explanation that the former was something that could be hung about one. And the passage in which Gideon is said to have made an ephod is little more certain. So little is known of what was actually done in that case, what was bought with the 1,700 shekels, and what was the cost of labor, that no sure conclusion is possible. If the passages quoted do not show that the ephods of Gideon and Micah were images, on the other hand it can not be proved that they were not. Still, the ephod was something habitually worn as a duty by the priests, and this does not agree with the supposition that the article was a standing image, as is required by the hypothesis that the sword of Goliath was placed behind such

Ephod not an Image.

an image (I Sam. xxi. 10). Moreover, supposing that Gideon's ephod was an image, the carrying of such a weight as is stated to have been the amount of the booty was beyond the power of a priest. In all cases but this, the ephod was made to be worn, and the ephod is never mentioned among the forbidden representations. Some suppose that the gold was used merely as a plating; in that case how massive must Gideon's ephod have been to require 1,700 shekels to cover it! And another terminology is employed to express such images (Ex. xx. 23, xxxii. 31). It is unlikely, too, that the same word would denote an image and a part of the priest's regalia, while a distinction is made between that and a linen ephod. Duhm's explanation of it as a golden mask which the priest put on is equally untenable (*Das Buch Jesaiah*, p. 200, Göttingen, 1892). Since other peoples made articles of clothing richly decorated to put on the images of their deities, it is not inconceivable that the Hebrews did the same.

The etymological meaning of the word is doubtful. Generally it is taken from a root meaning "to draw over," hence "covering." Lagarde connects it with an Arabic root meaning "to draw near to a greater as a mediator," and so makes it mean "a vestment in which to approach God." Support for this is found in the Syriac *pedhta*, from a root the same as the Arabic mentioned above. If this be the case, it gives the more reason for rejecting the meaning "image." See Images and Image-Worship, I. (W. Lotz.)

Bibliography: T. C. Foote, *The Ephod*, in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, Baltimore, 1900; idem, in *JBL*, 1902, pp. 1–48; B. Ugolini, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, xii. 785 sqq., Venice, 1744–69; W Baudissin, *Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums*, pp. 205 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; P. de Lagarde, in *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1889, 178; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, p. 382; Nowack, *Archäologie*, ii. 21 sqq., 118 sqq.; G. F. Moore, *Judges*, p. 381, New York, 1895; E. Sellin, *Beiträge zur israelitischen und jüdischen Religions-Geschichte*, II. i. 119–120, Leipsic, 1897; A. van Hoonacker, *Le Sacerdoce lévitique*, pp. 370 sqq., Louvain, 1899; *DB*, i. 725–727; *EB*, ii. 1306–09; *JE*, v. 185–187.

EPHRAEM (EPHREM) SYRUS ("Ephraim the Syrian"; Syriac *'Aphrem*): Theologian, exegete, and homilist; b. at or near Nisibis, in the beginning of the fourth century; d. probably near Edessa, possibly in June, 373, but the dates 378 and 379 are also given. His father is said to have been the priest of a deity or idol named Abnil or Abizal destroyed by Justinian. He was converted to Christianity by Bishop Jacob of Nisibis, with whom he is said to have attended the Council of Nicæa. He lived at Nisibis until 363, when he took up his residence near Edessa as an anchorite. He is said to have visited Basil of Cæsarea, to have been ordained deacon by him, and to have declined further ecclesiastical advancement. He went to Egypt and there remained for eight years, preaching to the monks in their own language. Shortly before his death he appeared as a public benefactor in the midst of a famine by opening a hospital for the sick in the monastery. His will forbade his burial in a church, and directed that he should be wrapped in his old cloak and laid in the common cemetery (cf. T. J. Lamy in *Compte rendu du IV congrès scientifique des Catholiques*, Freiburg in Switzerland, 1898, and R. Duval, in *JA*, 1901, Sept.–Oct., pp. 234–319). According to the Chronicle of Edessa his death occurred in June, 373; Jerome places his death under the emperor Valens. If the former date be correct, the encomium upon Basil (d. Jan. 1, 379), ascribed to Ephraem, can not be by him. All ecclesiastical calendars celebrate him, the Latin on Feb. 1, the Greek and Syriac on Jan. 28, the Coptic on 14 Epipi (July). At present his grave is shown in the Armenian cloister Dar Serkis west of Edessa (cf. C. E. Sachau, *Reise in Syrien*, Leipsic, 1883, p. 202).

Life.

The works of Ephraem were very numerous, according to Sozomen some 3,000,000 stichoi, a great part of which consisted of sermons and lectures. They do not easily separate into classes, though a provisional division is into exegetical, dogmatic-polemic, and poetical. In the latter branch he is credited with the invention of the "Controversial Hymn," called by Burkitt a "melancholy addition." From the standpoint of the intrinsic worth of the writings it is difficult to explain the great repute of this Father. The value consists in the fact that the great number of the productions and their excellent preservation afford many means of insight into the life and thought of the Church of his period. But Ephraem was prolix and repetitious, so that there is really little to reward the student for examination of his work. The difficulty in securing data is enhanced by the fact that many works ascribed to him are not his, and much of the work done upon Ephraem has to be done over in the light of better information, especially that gained from the Armenian version of his writings. Thus the examination of the New Testament quotations of Ephraem by F. H. Woods (*Studia biblica et ecclesiastica*, vol. iii., Oxford, 1891) was revised by F. C. Burkitt (*Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel*, in *TS*, vii. 2, 1901). In his exegetical work upon the Gospels his basis was Tatian's *Diatessaron* (cf. J. H. Hill, *Dissertation on the Gospel Commentary of S. Ephraem the Syrian*, Edinburgh, 1896). That in his work on the Acts he used a "Western" text has been shown by J. R. Harris (*Four Lectures on the Western Text*, Cambridge, 1894, pp. 23 sqq.). His Commentary upon Zechariah has been studied by Lamy (*Revue biblique*, 1897). Burkitt asserts that Revelation is not referred to in Ephraem's exegetical works.

Exegetical Works.

The theological writings are less valuable for their contributions to theology than for their reference to the heresies of the time. In the biography it appears that no less than nine arose in Edessa during his times and that he combated them all, among them the heresies of Marcion, Mani, and Bardesanes. The type of his theology is best seen in his "Sermon on our Lord" (in T. J. Lamy, i. 145–274; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., xiii. 305–330). This is a treatise on the incarnation; but the language is highly figurative and a clear idea of Ephraem's

Theological and Poetical Works.

views is hard to obtain from it. It was for his poetry that he was in ancient times most celebrated, since this gained for him the titles "Lyre of the Holy Ghost" and "Prophet of the Syrians." It was with this as a weapon that he fought against Bardesanes and his son Harmodius. In his hymns he used principally the measure of seven syllables, and the Syrian Church still makes use of his compositions (the "Nisibene Hymns" are in *NPNF*, ut sup., pp. 165–220).

Ephraem was not the founder of a school of theology or exegesis like that of Antioch. It appears that his works were translated into Greek, since Sozomen states that they lose little by being so rendered. Jerome read but one in the Greek, that on the Holy Ghost. Burkitt criticizes Ephraem's theology as giving neither the historical Christ, nor the Christianity of the early Church, nor yet the clearly defined doctrine of post-Nicene times, and as failing in the point of intellectual seriousness.

E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief edition of the "Works," begun by Peter Mobarek (Benedict) and finished by J. S. A. Assemani, was published, 6 vols., Rome, 1732–46. Other editions are: *Opera selecta*, ed. J. J. Overbeck, Oxford, 1865; *Carmina Nisibena*, ed. G. Bickell, Leipsic, 1866; *Hymni et Sermones*, ed. T. J. Lamy, 3 vols., Mechlin, 1882–86; "History of Joseph," Paris, 1891; fragments of the "Commentary on the Diatessaron," ed. J. R. Harris, London, 1895. Transl. into Germ. are of selected works by P. Zingerle, 6 vols., Innsbruck, 1831–45, and by F. X. Reithmeyer, in *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, Kempten, 1869. Of Eng. transl. may be mentioned: *Select Works*, by J. B. Morris, Oxford, 1847; *Repentance of Nineveh*, and *Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies*, by H. Burgess, 3 vols., London, 1853; *NPNF*, 2d ser., xiii. 167–341. Eng. transls. of ten of his hymns are in B. Pick, *Hymns and Poetry of the Eastern Church*, New York, 1908.

The sources for a life are: the *Encomium* of Ephraem by Gregory of Nyssa (best); and the briefer notices in Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 16; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 30, iv. 29; Jerome, *De vir. ill.*. 115. The best discussion of the life in Eng. is in *NPNF*, 2d ser., xiii. 119–146; valuable, however, is *DCB*, ii. 136–144. Consult further: J. F. Gaab, in *Memorabilien*, ii. 136 sqq., cf. i. 65 sqq., Leipsic, 1791–96; J. Alsleben, *Das Leben des Ephraem des Syrers*, Berlin, 1853; C. Ferry, *S. Éphrem poète*, Paris, 1877; *KL*, iv. 677–682; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 926–933.

On the writings consult: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 59 sqq., Rome, 1719; C. von Lengerke, *Commentatio critica d. S. Ephræmo Syro*, Halle, 1828; idem, *De Ephræmi . . arte hermeneutica*, Königsberg, 1831; A. Haase, *S. Ephræmi Syri theologia*, Halle, 1869; Moesinger, *Evangelii concordantis expositio*, Venice, 1876; E. A. W. Budge, *On a Fragment of a Coptic Version of S. Ephraim on the Transfiguration*, London, 1887; *Ephræmi Syri commentarii in epistolas Pauli*, Venice, 1893; H. Grimme, *Der Strophenbau in den Gedichten Ephraems des Syrers*, Freiburg, 1893; T. J. Lamy, *L'Exégèse en l'orient au quatrième siècle*, iv. 465–486, Paris, 1893; J. Gwynn, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, pp. cii.–ciii., Dublin, 1894; W. Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, London, 1894; R. Duval, *La Littérature araméenne*, Paris, 1895; H. Hering, *Die Lehre von der Predigt*, Berlin, 1897; *NPNF*, xiii. 146–152.

EPHRATA COMMUNITY. See COMMUNISM, II., 5.

EPICTETUS: Stoic philosopher; b. at Hierapolis (121 m. s.e. of Smyrna), in Phrygia, c. 50 A.D.; d. at Nicopolis (3 m. n. of Prevesa), in Epirus, c. 120. For a time he lived in Rome as the slave of Epaphroditus, a freedman and favorite of Nero, but later he secured his freedom and became a courtier of Nero. He studied the Stoic philosophy under Musonius Rufus and achieved distinction at Rome as a teacher of philosophy. When Domitian drove the philosophers from Rome about 90 A.D. Epictetus settled at Nicopolis, where he taught with great success till the end of his life. He seems to have written nothing himself, but his sayings were recorded by his pupil Flavius Arianus, who did for his master what Xenophon did for Socrates. As reported by Arianus, the works of Epictetus consist of the *Encheiridion*, a manual of moral teaching, and the "Discourses" in eight books, of which only four are extant.

As a philosopher Epictetus was intensely practical, and his teaching was concerned with the conduct of life, rather than with the problems of metaphysics. His ethics are of peculiar interest because of the similarity between his teachings and those of Jesus. Like other Stoics (see STOICISM) he made virtue the purpose and end of life and identified a virtuous life with a happy life. As this ideal is to be attained largely through asceticism, "bear and forbear" becomes the watchword of a virtuous and, therefore, happy life. To be happy, one must restrict his desires and not meddle with things over which he has no control. The only thing in the world that is absolutely ours is our will. Nothing can break that; whatever we do, we do because we will it. But this will in us is only the divine will; and hence Epictetus deduces all moral laws from the will of God. As rational creatures we have part in the reason of God; we are divine. All that is irrational in the world, external sin and evil, is merely an appearance, and should not affect us. Epictetus lived in accordance with his ascetic teachings and is described as a model of wisdom and virtue.

His works have been edited by J. Schweighäuser (5 vols., Leipsic, 1799–1800), and by H. Schenkl, (Leipsic, 1894; 1898). Among translations may be mentioned that of Elizabeth Carter (London, 1758), which has been revised and edited by T. W. Higginson (Boston, 1865), also those of George Long (London, 1890) and T. W. Rolleston (London, 1888).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The early life is by Diogenes Laertius in his "Lives of the Philosophers" (best edition by H. G. Hübner, Leipsic, 1828–31). For a modern appreciation consult F. W. Farrar, *Seekers after God*, London, 1868. For further discussion consult F. Ueberweg, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, ed. M. Heinze, Berlin, 1896–97, and in Eng. the translations of the History of Philosophy of Erdmann (London, 1893), and of Windelband (ib. 1893). Also, E. M. Schranka, *Der Stoiker Epiktet und seine Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1885; A. Bonhöffer, *Epictet und die Stoa*, Stuttgart, 1890; idem, *Die Ethik des . . Epictet*, ib. 1894. Other literature is indicated in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, iii. 1, pp. 191–192, New York, 1905.

EPICUREANISM: The philosophy of Epicurus (342–270 B.C.), more particularly his ethics. The term is also applied loosely to any hedonistic tendency in morals. Building upon the materialistic metaphysics of Democritus, and the hedonistic teachings of Aristippus, Epicurus reached the view that happiness, or pleasure, is the chief good and the only possible end of rational action. In popular thought Epicureanism has received a crude interpretation not justified by the teachings of its founder. According to Epicurus, pleasure, though

desirable, is not always to be chosen, for it may lead to pain greater than itself. It is not the pleasure of the moment, therefore, that we are to follow (the view of the Cyrenaics), but pleasure in a larger sense, including the pleasures of the mind, as well as those of sense. The chief good, then, becomes a happy life as a whole, the substance of which, in the view of Epicurus, is a healthy body and a tranquil mind. He held that some desires are unnatural, others unnecessary. These are to be controlled. He is reported to have said, "If thou wilt make a man happy, add not unto his riches, but take away from his desires."

With Epicurus the cardinal virtue is the insight necessary to regulate the desires and thus secure an ultimate preponderance of pleasure over pain. From this virtue all others follow. On the whole, his teaching is hardly less rigorous than that of the Stoics, who expressly made virtue the end of conduct. A virtuous life, Epicurus holds, is the condition of a happy life; if one is consistently virtuous, his life can be only one of happiness. He taught a prudential justice. The just man spares himself the annoyance to which an unjust man is subjected by his fellows. Fear of the gods and fear of death Epicurus considered superstitions disturbing to a happy life, because, as happy and imperishable creatures, the gods have nothing to do with the affairs of this world. Unlike other philosophers of his time Epicurus believed in the freedom of the will. Epicureanism was long popular in Rome and was one of the four philosophical schools endowed by Marcus Aurelius. Through his *De natura rerum* Lucretius became the chief literary representative of Epicurean philosophy. The teachings of Epicurus, revived by Pierre Gassendi (q.v.) became extremely popular in the time of the English deists and the French encyclopedists.

Bibliography: P. von Gizycki, *Ueber das Leben und Moralphilosophie des Epikurus*, Berlin, 1879; E. Pfleiderer, *Eudämonismus und Egoismus*, Leipsic, 1880; W. Wallace, *Epicureanism*, London, 1880; W. L. Courtney, *Studies in Philosophy*, ib. 1882; T. C. Baring, *The Scheme of Epicurus*, ib. 1884; F. W. Newman, *Epicureanism*, in *Miscellanies*, vol. iv., ib. 1891; P. Cassel, *Epikuros der Philosoph*, Berlin, 1892; E. Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, London, 1892; H. O. Newland, *Epicureanism*, ib. 1900; J. Masson, *Lucretius, Epicurean and Poet*, ib., 1908; and the general works by A. W. Benn (*Greek Philosophers*, ib. 1882), B. Erdmann (*Hist. of Philosophy*, ib. 1893), and W. Windelband (*Hist. of Ancient Philosophy*, ib. 1900). Additional literature is indicated in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, iii. 1, pp. 192–194, 351–352, New York, 1905.

EPIKLESIS OR INVOCATION: In the strict sense of the term, the liturgical prayer by which generally in the ancient Church, and to this day in the Eastern, the sacramental elements (water, oil, bread and wine) are consecrated; a prayer in which God is asked to send down the Holy Ghost upon the elements, the assumption being that such a prayer has the mysterious power of bringing the Holy Ghost into such relation with the elements that they become operative for their purpose. Since this purpose is the sanctification of the receivers of the sacrament, a prayer for this also is usually included in the epiklesis. Its position in the liturgy is generally after the thanksgiving and words of institution. As a rule it begins with what is called the anamnesis or commemoration, followed by the anaphora or oblation, after which comes the epiklesis proper. It has a natural affinity with the prayers of consecration in the so-called Sacramentals (q.v.), but is to be distinguished definitely from them. See Holy Water.

The oldest evidence for the epiklesis in the form of a prayer of consecration for the baptismal water is found in Tertullian (*De baptismate*, iv.); but there is no doubt that it was a constant feature of the baptismal rite in both East and West throughout the third and fourth centuries. In the West the next oldest evidence is scarcely Cyprian, who speaks only of a "cleansing and sanctifying" of the baptismal water (*Epist.*, lxx. 1), but rather the Synod of Carthage of 256, with its phrase "The water sanctified by prayer." Ambrose asserts (*De spiritu sancto*, I. vii. 88) that the descent of the Holy Ghost, effected by the prayer of the priest, hallows the water, and Jerome (*Contra Luciferum*, vi. and vii.) is unable to conceive any true baptism without such a descent. Augustine bears unmistakable witness to the same usage; yet he, together with Ambrose, was to a great extent responsible for upsetting the universal belief in the efficacy of the epiklesis and replacing it, as the central point in the action of the Eucharist at least, by the words of institution. In his conflict with the Donatists he felt obliged to place the consecrating power less in a prayer of epiklesis, which was clearly in his time not uniform in its wording, than in a fixed, authoritative formula, such as was that of baptism, resting upon the words of institution of the sacrament. This opened the way for a new view of consecration, which in the Eucharist especially came to be of decisive importance.

In the Baptismal Service.

It was not long before Augustine's teaching bore fruit. It is combined with the older view in the pseudo-Ambrosian treatise *De sacramentis* (II. v. 14), and probably determined the inclusion of the words of institution in the epiklesis of the sacramentary of Gelasius, a formulary which, with some changes, is still used in the Roman Catholic Church at the benediction of the baptismal water. The corresponding formulary in the Greek Church is a simple epiklesis without the words of institution.

In the case of the Eucharist, plenty of evidences from the fourth and fifth centuries, both Eastern and Western, attribute the consecration of the elements to the epiklesis; but the agreement is not so universal as in the case of baptism, nor is it safe to assume that the epiklesis was in use from the beginning as a prayer of consecration, which it came to be considered in the East. The oldest witness for the Eucharistic epiklesis is Irenæus, who says (IV. xviii. 5) "The bread which receives the invocation of God is no longer common bread but the Eucharist"; but that this phrase can not be pressed is shown by the occurrence in the preceding section of another in which that bread is said to be the body of the Lord "over which thanks have been given," and the context shows that this giving of thanks (*eucharistein*) is not to be taken as simply a general term for consecration. The epi-

In the Eucharist.

klesis is mentioned again in the second so-called Pfaff fragment of Irenæus, not much later than his time, and by Firmilian of Cæsarea (Cyprian, *Epist.*, lxxv.). In the fourth century the evidences become more numerous; it is mentioned by Basil the Great, most frequently and definitely (as having the force of consecration) by Cyril of Jerusalem, again by Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Theophilus, Chrysostom, and Ephraem Syrus. But the most striking proof of the position which it held in the East is the fact that there is not a single Oriental liturgy in which it is absent or in which it is not regarded as having consecrating force.

The earliest Western authority for the epiklesis in the Eucharist is Ambrose (*De spiritu sancto*, III. xvi. 112 and *De fide*, IV x. 124), who shows in these passages not only his acquaintance with it but his belief in its consecrating force. In two other passages he seems to attribute this force to the words of institution, which only shows how little the question was definitely worked out in that period. Augustine was hindered by his symbolic conception of the Eucharist from fully applying Ambrose's ideas on this point to it; but certain phrases of his were taken by a later age as decisive against the consecrating virtue of the epiklesis. It found, however, down to the seventh century, authors who still attributed to it its earlier importance, such as Fulgentius of Ruspe, Optatus of Mileve, Gaudentius of Brescia, and Isidore of Seville.

The conclusions indicated by the passages referred to are confirmed by the oldest Western liturgies, which exhibit the epiklesis in universal use here as a prayer of consecration for the Eucharist in the fourth and fifth centuries, then either disappearing or altered and removed from its original position immediately after the words of institution. The oldest Gallican liturgies known show no trace of this process, whose center-point was probably at Rome. It is true that Gelasius I. (492–496) still knows and approves of the epiklesis; but the simplifying and unifying work which won the name of reformers of the liturgy for him and Gregory the Great eliminated or transformed it in the Roman liturgy, whose acceptance in Gaul and later in Spain ended by bringing about the same results there too.

Western Liturgies.

In conclusion it may be safely said that the epiklesis is not primitive, and its origin may be attributed to a combination of Biblical terms with pagan popular notions. The Scriptural formula "to call upon the name of the Lord" (Joel ii. 32, quoted Acts ii. 21 and Rom. x. 13; Acts ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16; I Cor. i. 2) recurs in many types of epiklesis. Among the Gnostics the Name (q.v.), as a powerful mystic formula, is of the greatest importance; its possession enables a man to call down the Godhead. Nothing was to be employed in Christian worship which had not been previously "hallowed" from demoniac influences; and the Holy Ghost, as the sanctifying power, must thus be called down upon the creatures of water, oil, bread, and wine—a conclusion the more natural that in the Scriptural narratives of the baptism of Christ the Holy Ghost had descended in visible form. The theory that the definite epiklesis originated in Gnostic circles, where it was unquestionably widely used, and then found its way into the practise of the Church, is incapable of demonstration; it may well have originated in both about the same time, and had a more rapid development among the Gnostics. If it were certain that the extant magical papyri of the later mystery-cults were of purely pagan origin, uninfluenced by Gnostic views, they would afford more than a heathen parallel for the Christian epiklesis; for in them the words *epiklesis*, *epikaleisthai* are the technical terms for the invocation of the Godhead on all kinds of gifts, such as wine, water, and milk. At least an analogous view may be clearly shown in later paganism in the consecration of statues of the gods, for which again an epiklesis was in use. (P DREWS.)

Conclusion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: From the Catholic standpoint: L. A. Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgien und der römischen Konsekrationskanon*, Schaffhausen, 1864; J. Franz, *Der eucharistische Konsekrationsmoment*, Würzburg, 1875; idem, *Die eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese*, ib. 1880; F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien*, Tübingen, 1872; idem, *Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Münster, 1893; idem, *Die abendländische Messe vom 5. bis zum 8. Jahrhunderte*, ib. 1896; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. 721, 728 sqq.; *KL*, iv. 686–696.

From the Protestant standpoint: P. Zorn, *Dissertatio de ἐπικλήσει*, Rostock, 1705; J. W. F. Höfling, *Das Sakrament der Taufe*, i. 470 sqq., Erlangen, 1846; G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, Göttingen, 1894.

EPIPHANES. See CARPOCRATES AND THE CARPOCRATIANS.

EPIPHANIUS OF CONSTANTIA: Greek Church Father; b. at Basanduk (near Eleutheropolis, the modern Bet Jibrin, 23 m. s.w. of Jerusalem), probably between 310 and 320; d. at sea 403. It is very doubtful whether his parents were Jews, for while still a youth he lived among the monks of Egypt, where he came into conflict with Gnostic heretics and succeeded in expelling some eighty members of the sect. In his native town he founded a monastery and was ordained presbyter by the bishop of Eleutheropolis. He was possibly a close friend of Hilarion, although the statements in his *Vita* concerning their relations are devoid of historicity. But there is no doubt that he was a faithful adherent of the Nicene Creed, and because of his reputation for learning and piety he was made bishop of Constantia in Cyprus and metropolitan of the island in 357. He established monasticism in his see, and was so deeply venerated that his judgment was sought on all sides. Thus originated many of his works, such as his epistle on the perpetual virginity of Mary, his "Fast-anchored," his "Medicine Chest," and his "Twelve Gems."

Life.

Next to his zeal for monasticism, Epiphanius was characterized by his orthodoxy. He regarded Origen as the father of all heresies, and made the task of his life the crushing of his opponent. His hatred was based on the fact that Origen was the source of Arianism and had also received a Greek training, with which was connected a spiritualism

which Epiphanius opposed by a crass realism. He therefore became the leader of a reaction against Origen which assailed all Greek culture within the Church. While on a visit to Jerusalem (probably in 393), he contended in the Church of the Resurrection against the teachings of Origen as the root of Arianism until Bishop Johannes compelled him to desist. Johannes replied with a sermon against "anthropomorphism," but Epiphanius, though he too repudiated all anthropomorphistic doctrines, besought the bishop to abandon the teachings of his opponent. Some time afterward he ordained a monk, the brother of Jerome, priest at Bethlehem, a violation of the episcopal rights of Johannes which he felt himself obliged to justify. He had another occasion to manifest his antipathy to Origen, when Theophilus of Alexandria came over to his side and sought to annihilate the followers of his former teacher in the Nitrian desert. The disciples of Origen took refuge with Chrysostom, and Theophilus urged Epiphanius to convene a synod to condemn Origen and to send its rulings to him, to Chrysostom, and other bishops. Epiphanius eagerly assented, held the synod, and hastened to Constantinople, at the invitation of Theophilus, in 402. There, however, he avoided meeting Chrysostom, but performed another ordination which contravened ecclesiastical law and informed the bishops whom he had assembled of the condemnation of Origen. After a fruitless endeavor to secure the expulsion and excommunication of the adherents of Origen and the condemnation of his writings, he left the city in rage, but died before he reached Cyprus.

Opposition to Origen.

The extraordinary reputation of Epiphanius among his contemporaries was due to his union of monastic asceticism with deep learning and zeal for orthodoxy, and he may be regarded as the representative of the tendency of his time to drive paganism at all costs from the position which it still held. His importance for posterity, on the other hand, is found in the contents of his writings. His "Fast-anchored" affords insight into the theology of the period, and it contains a detailed exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity and the Resurrection, and polemics against the Arians, Origen, and others. Far more important is the "Medicine Chest," which was based largely on Irenæus and the lost "Heresies" of Hippolytus. The other sources of Epiphanius are more difficult to trace. Once he quotes Clement of Alexandria as his authority, but shows himself independent in his discussion of many of the older heresies, especially the Jewish and Samaritan sects, the Ebionites, the Valentinians, and the Marcionites. With all his limitations, his work remains a valuable source for the heresies of the fourth century. The "Recapitulation," which was used by Augustine, may also have been a separate work of Epiphanius. His "Weights and Measures" is devoted chiefly to the books of the Bible, their translations, the geography of Palestine, and other Biblical subjects. His "Twelve Gems," on the twelve precious stones in the breastplate of the high priest, is extant only in two excerpts, one edited by Konrad Gesner (Zurich, 1565), and the other preserved as the fortieth question of Anastasius. The Latin translation of the latter, which is incomplete at the beginning and the end, was first published by P. F. Foggini (Rome, 1750), but the exegesis of the Song of Solomon, also translated by the same scholar, is really an abridgment of a work of Philo of Carpasia. The letters of Epiphanius to Johannes of Jerusalem and Jerome have been preserved in Latin translation, but the Homilies, the *Vitæ prophetorum*, the *De numerorum mysteriis*, and the so-called *Physiologus* are spurious.

Character and Significance.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: The editio princeps of the *Opera* is by J. Hervagius, Basel, 1544; the editions by D. Petavius, Paris, 1622, and W Dindorf, Leipsic, 1859-62 (critical) contain the *Vita* ascribed to an alleged companion of Epiphanius, Polybius (worthless as a source). Sources for a life are: Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 10, 12; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 32, vii. 27, viii. 14; Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, cxiv. For more modern discussions of his life consult: A. Gervaise, *Histoire de la vie de S. Épiphane*, Paris, 1738; *DCB*, ii. 149-156 (by R. A. Lipsius, elaborate); Neander, *Christian Church*, vols. i., ii.; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 926-933 et passim. For treatment of various phases of criticism consult: B. Eberhard, *Die Betheiligung des Epiphanius am Streite über Origenes*, Trier, 1850; R. A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*, Vienna, 1865; idem, *Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 91 sqq., Leipsic, 1874; A. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, pp. 80 sqq., ib. 1884; H. G. Voigt, *Eine verschollene Urkunde des antimontanistischen Kampfes*, ib. 1891; E. Rolffs, in *TU*, xii. 4, 1895; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 874 sqq.; G. Rauschen, *Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche*, pp. 382-383, 404, 552 sqq., Freiburg, 1897; Krüger, *History*, passim; Harnack, *Dogma*, especially vol. ii.

EPIPHANIUS SCHOLASTICUS: A friend and assistant of Cassiodorus (q.v.) at whose request he translated many Greek works into Latin, viz.: (1) the church histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which he combined into one; under the name of *Historia tripartita*, it was the most popular compendium on its subject in the Middle Ages; (2) the collection of synodical epistles sent to the emperor Leo I. in defense of the Council of Chalcedon and in condemnation of Timotheus Ælurus (generally known as the *Codex Encyclius*); (3) the commentary of Didymus the Blind on the Catholic Epistles; (4) the commentary of Epiphanius of Salamis on the Song of Solomon. G. Krüger.

Bibliography: Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 524, xi. 102; *DCB*, ii. 159-160.

EPIPHANIUS OF TICINUM: Bishop of Ticinum (Pavia); b. at Ticinum 438 or 439; d. there Jan. 21, 496. He was elected bishop in 466 and was consecrated at Milan. He is described as of gracious personality and bearing and of great popularity. In the troublous times that preceded the downfall of the Western empire, Epiphanius became the advocate and protector of his flock against the barbarian leaders in whose hands lay the fate of Italy. In 471 he went to Rome as delegate of the nobles and populace of Liguria to act as mediator between the emperor Anthemius and his son-in-law the king-maker Ricimer and succeeded in preventing war, though he could not save Anthemius from death by the orders of Ricimer in the following year. In 474 he was the

ambassador of the emperor Julius Nepos at the court of the Visigothic king Euric, whom he persuaded to abstain from hostilities against the empire. In the same year the Heruli under Odoacer attacked Pavia and destroyed the cathedral; but Epiphanius obtained from the conqueror the remission of five years' taxes for the city and devoted himself to its restoration. He stood in the good graces of Theodoric, who sent him on a mission to Lyons in 494 to obtain from the Burgundian king Gundobad the release of his Ligurian prisoners. Epiphanius was the means of bringing back more than 6,000 men to the depopulated fields of northern Italy. There is a tradition that his body was brought to Hildesheim in 962.

(T. Förster†.)

Bibliography: The *Vita* by Magnus Felix Ennodius is in *MGH.*, *Auct. ant.*, vii (1885), 84–109, and in *MPL*, lxiii. 207–240.

EPIPHANY, FEAST OF THE: A festival celebrated in honor of Christ on Jan. 6, or some day near that date. It is first found among the Basilidians in Egypt, with whom it was the commemoration of the baptism of Christ. This was also the main reference of the festival when its observance became general in the Eastern Church. In some instances the birth of Christ was also commemorated on that day. But this meaning was not retained when, at the close of the fourth century, the Eastern Church adopted the custom of the Western, to celebrate the birth on Dec. 25. The Epiphany festival is first mentioned in the West in the fourth century. It is possible that in Gaul at least the birth of Christ was celebrated on that day; but in later times the celebration in the West generally referred to the worship of the Magi in chronological connection with the celebration of the birth on Dec. 25. References to the baptism occur, nevertheless, down to the Middle Ages, which makes it probable that wherever the festival was celebrated in the West before Christmas was fixed for Dec. 25, it concerned the baptism of Christ. In the Middle Ages the worship of the Magi was retained as the principal fact. Yet mention was also made of the miracle at Cana, and even of the resuscitation of Lazarus. The idea was the manifestation of the glory of Christ, as may be seen from the Roman Gospels for the Sundays after Epiphany which relate his being found in the Temple, the manifestation of his glory at Cana, the faith of the centurion, and the stilling of the tempest. The special functions which marked the day in the East were the preliminary steps to baptism and the blessing of the font, and the announcement of the date of Easter. Among popular customs some remains of the dramatic representation of the coming of the Magi have been retained in certain places.

Luther reverting to the original meaning of the day desired that preachers should refer to Christ's baptism and to Christian baptism in general, and himself preached on that subject. But he did not succeed in imposing his view on the Lutheran Church, which retained Matt. ii. 1–12 as the Scripture lesson for the day. Before the end of the sixteenth century the celebration of the day was abolished in some territories; among the Reformed it ceased entirely. Even among Lutherans the festival fell more and more into disuse, as unnecessary, or was transferred to the following Sunday, as in Prussia in 1754. At present there is much diversity of practise: in some parts the day is still kept as a great festival, in others it is a so-called "half holy-day," i.e., a day of purely ritual observance, with a church service; in others again it is not celebrated at all, though the following Sundays are still counted as Sundays after Epiphany. The efforts to restore the day are not likely to be successful. It follows too soon after Christmas and it is difficult to give it a special significance in addition to that of the greater festival. A suggestion that the day should be celebrated as a general missionary festival has this against it, that in many places missionary festivals have already been introduced with special peculiarities, and it would be undesirable to interfere with them. Thus only Luther's suggestion would remain, to make the day a baptismal festival. But this suggestion also has little prospect of successful execution. The festival, in our conditions, suffers from the difficulty of retaining the day as an ecclesiastical festival while it has attached to it no generally acknowledged special event to be celebrated. [In the modern Roman Catholic Church, it is the double of the first class, with an octave, and the Anglican Communion has retained it among the greater or "red-letter" holy-days, with a special service appointed.]

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, book xx., chap. iv.; E. Martene, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, iii. 42, Venice, 1783; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. 1, pp. 310 sqq., 7 vols., Mainz, 1837–41; P. de Lagarde, *Ueber das Weihnachtsfest*, in *Mitteilungen*, vol. iv., Göttingen, 1891; T. Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, 8 vols., Rostock, 1854–61; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, passim, London, 1904; *DCA*, i. 617–621 (a worthy account).

EPISCOPACY.

I. The Roman Catholic Church.
II. The Eastern Church.
III. The Jansenist Church of Holland and the Old Catholics.
IV The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church.
V. The Reformed Episcopal Church.
VI. The Moravian Church.
VII. The Lutheran Churches.
VIII. The Reformed Churches.
IX. The American Methodist Episcopal Churches.
X. The Historic Episcopate.

Episcopacy is church government by bishops. The purpose of this article is to give a concise statement of the views concerning the episcopal office held by different Christian communions; for the origin of the office, its historic development, and theories of its relative dignity, see Polity, Ecclesiastical; for the selection of bishops and their duties, see Bishop; see also the articles upon the several bodies named below.

I. The Roman Catholic Church holds to the divine origin and authority of episcopacy. Its position was distinctly defined by the Council of Trent: "If any one saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordination instituted, consisting of bishops, priests and ministers; let him be anathema. If any one saith that bishops are not superior to priests or that the power which they possess is common to

them and to priests let him be anathema" (session xxiii. 6, 7). Episcopacy is held as essential to the Church as the sacraments; the Church can not exist without it. The words of Cyprian (*Epist.*, lxviii. [lxvi., lxix.] 8, *ANF*, v. 374–375), "the Church is in the bishop," present this view concisely. The bishops are the immediate successors of the apostles,—"all chief rulers by vicarious ordination succeed to the apostles" (Cyprian, ut sup., 4, *ANF*, v. 373). Another view was quite prevalent in the Middle Ages, viz., that all bishops are successors of St. Peter and stand in his stead ("the leaders of the Church, who hold the place of Peter," Robert Grosseteste, *Epist.*, xxiii., ed. Luard, Rolls Series, no. 25), a view held also by the Church Fathers. It is a matter of uncertainty whether the bishops are an order distinct from the priests or not (cf. Friedberg, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 150). They are certainly superior to priests and deacons not merely in jurisdiction but in the kind of grace they possess. In their consecration a special grace is imparted and they alone have the right to ordain and thus confer an indelible grace. Thomas Aquinas again and again affirms that the episcopate is not a distinct order and that consecration to it has not a sacramental character (cf. *Sententiæ*, IV. xxiv. 3; *Summa, Supp.*, xi. 5, ed. Migne, iv. 1074). The Council of Trent speaks of the "hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons" but its language is susceptible of a twofold interpretation, for it classes subdeacons with the *ordines majores* (session xxiii. 2). Innocent III. (1198–1216) included the subdeacon in the *ordines majores*. If the subdiaconate be an order by itself then the bishop belongs to the order of the priesthood and is not a distinct order.

The pope is at the head of the hierarchy of bishops and, as the immediate successor of Peter, all bishops are subject to him as the vicar of Christ and the successor of the divinely appointed head of the apostles. The confirmation of bishops by the pope was made a fixed rule by Nicholas III (1277–80). The theory that the bishops are assistants of the pope was definitely stated by Innocent III. Quoting Leo I. (*Epist.*, vi., *MPL*, liv. 671) he declared that they receive their authority to assist the pope and not as having "plenitude of power" (cf. Döllinger-Friedrich, *Papstthum*, Munich, 1892, pp. 73, 409). This theory was advocated by the papal publicists in the early half of the fourteenth century and opposed by the anti-papal publicists of the same age, such as Pierre Dubois, and by Gerson and other Gallican leaders in the fifteenth century. This view of Innocent III. seriously limits the prerogative of the bishops and enables the pope to depose them and makes their resignation valid only when accepted by him. The Vatican Decrees (iv. 3; Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 262 sqq.) order obedience to the pope by "all pastors" in "all matters that belong to faith and morals and also in those that pertain to the government and discipline of the Church," and also assert "that their episcopal authority is really strengthened and protected by the supreme and universal Pastor." The struggle over the Gallican and Ultramontane theories of the jurisdiction and original authority of the episcopate was theoretically brought to a close by the decision of the Vatican Council.

II. The Eastern Church holds likewise to the divine origin of episcopacy, to the transmission of apostolic grace, and to apostolic succession. It dissents from the Latin Church in refusing to recognize the pope as the spiritual head of all Christendom, but is ready to acknowledge him as the patriarch of Western Christendom, occupying an equal dignity with the four historic patriarchs of the East, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

III. The Jansenist Church of Holland and the Old Catholics both agree with the Roman Catholic Church on the question of the divine authority of episcopacy, but differ from it in holding the Gallican theory of the episcopate, i.e., they deny to the pope anything more than an appellate and supervisory jurisdiction over the Church, hold that he may err, and that ecumenical councils are superior to him in authority. The episcopate of the Dutch Jansenists was received in 1724 from Dominique Marie Varlet, Bishop of Babylon, then living in Amsterdam. Other Roman Catholic bishops, on being applied to, refused the rite of consecration. Each new consecration ever since has been noticed by a special excommunication from Rome. The Old Catholics secured their orders from the Jansenists of Holland, the bishop of Deventer consecrating Bishop Reinkens (Aug. 11, 1873), who subsequently consecrated Dr. Herzog bishop for Switzerland (Sept. 18, 1876), so that they preserved the apostolic succession.

IV. The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States tolerate two classes of opinion,—the Anglo-Catholic or High-church view, and the Low- or Broad-church view. (1) The Anglo-Catholic view of the episcopate is in essential particulars that of the Roman Catholic Church. It does not recognize the superior authority of the pope, as the vicar of Christ and the infallible successor of St. Peter, nor even place ordination among the sacraments. But it regards episcopacy as indispensable to the very being of the Church, holds to the transmission of grace by the imposition of hands, accepts apostolic succession, and denies validity to any ministry not ordained by bishops. Bishops "as being the successors of the apostles are possessed of the same power of jurisdiction" (J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, p. 85, London, 1870). They are, and have been from the time of the apostles, an order distinct from the priesthood and diaconate and higher than both. As late as 1618 the highest authority in the Church of England, James I., recognized the ordination of the Reformed Churches of the Continent when he sent a delegation made up in part of bishops to the Synod of Dort. Archbishop Laud (1633–45) was the most extreme representative of the *jure divino* right of episcopacy the Church of England has had, and his intolerance brought him to the block. (2) The Low- and Broad-church view regards the episcopate as desirable and necessary for the well-being, not to the being, of the Church. The episcopal

is not the only form of government with Scriptural authority (if, indeed, it or any other be recommended by Scripture); but it is the one best adapted to forward the interests of Christ's kingdom among men. The best Anglican writers on this side agree that the episcopate developed out of the presbyterate, and that there are only two orders of the ministry in the New Testament,—presbyters and deacons. Dr. Lightfoot, bishop of Durham, in his scholarly and exhaustive discussion of the subject (commentary on Philippians, pp. 180–267), says, "It is clear, that, at the close of the Apostolic Age, the two lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established; but traces of the episcopate, properly so called, are few and indistinct. The episcopate was formed out of the presbyteral order by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief of them." And again he says, "The episcopate was formed out of the presbytery." After he was made bishop he stated that his views on the episcopate had been misunderstood. Dean Stanley (*Christian Institutions*, p. 210) representing the same view, says, "According to the strict rules of the Church derived from those early times, there are but two orders,—presbyters and deacons."

This view, which is also held by such men as Arnold, Alford, Jacob, and Hatch, was the view of the divines of the English Reformation. Cranmer, Jewel, Grindal, and afterward Field ("The apostles left none to succeed them," *Of the Church*, vol. iv., p. vii.), defended episcopacy as the most ancient and general form of government, but always acknowledged the validity of Presbyterian orders. (Cf. G. P. Fisher, in the *New Englander*, 1874, pp. 121–172.) Bishop Parkhurst looked upon the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community; and Bishop Ponet would have abandoned even the term "bishop" to the Catholics, Ecclesiastics held positions in the Church of England who had received only Presbyterian ordination. Such were Whittingham, Dean of Durham, Cartwright, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and Travers, provost of Trinity College, Dublin. It is doubtful whether any prelate of the English Church in Elizabeth's reign held the *jure divino* theory of episcopacy, though Archbishop Bancroft (d. 1605) seems to have been the first Anglican prelate to avow it. Two of the most elaborate defenders of the Low-church view in the seventeenth century were Stillingfleet and Ussher, the latter representing the episcopate as only a presidency of the presbyter over his peers; yet the Episcopal Church reordains all ministers who have not been episcopally ordained, but accepts priests of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches without reordination.

The orders of the Anglican Church were declared invalid by Leo XIII. in the bull *Apostolicæ curæ* of Sept. 13, 1896 (in Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 406), the decision being based on certain defects in the form of ordination. Mr. Gladstone's appeal to the pope to hold the decision in abeyance was not heeded. The archbishops of Canterbury and York united in a reply (1897).

V. The Reformed Episcopal Church holds to an episcopacy of expediency. "It adheres to episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of church polity" (*Declaration of Principles*, Dec. 1, 1873). Its founder and first bishop was George David Cummins (q.v.), who had been assistant bishop of the Episcopal Church in Kentucky.

VI. The Moravian Church deserves separate and special mention, for three reasons. Its episcopate was active before the Reformation on the Continent and in England began; it is in the apostolic succession; and its bishopric in America antedates those of the Episcopal (1784) and Methodist (1784) denominations by forty years, August Gottlieb Spangenberg (q.v.) having been consecrated in Germany, 1744, and exercised oversight in Pennsylvania from 1745 to 1762. The first bishops consecrated in America were the Moravians, Martin Mack, at Bethlehem, Oct. 18, 1770, and Michael Graff, at Bethlehem, June 6, 1773. The first Moravian bishop was consecrated at Lhotka in 1467 by the regularly ordained Waldensian bishop Stephen (cf. E. A. de Schweinitz, *The Moravian Episcopate*, London, 1877; see Bohemian Brethren). The British parliament recognized the validity of Moravian ordination in 1749. In 1881, however, Bishop Stevens of Pennsylvania reordained a Moravian presbyter, aiming to give him "a more ample ordination." The Moravians recognize the ordination of other Christian bodies as valid, admitting presbyters at once into their ministry (*Law Book of the Church*, ix. 63). [The medieval Waldenses had a connexional organization with bishops or general superintendents (*majores* or *majorales*), ordained if possible by other *majores;* in the absence of a major, by presbyters. They claimed apostolic succession for their majores. Their authority in ordaining and in exercising discipline was much greater than that of presbyters (cf. B. Gui, *Practica Inquisitionis hereticæ pravitatis*, ed. C. Douais, Paris, 1886, pp. 136–137). The Moravian Anabaptists had a similar polity with a single bishop or head of the whole connection.

A. H. N.]

VII. The Lutheran Churches have for the most part abandoned episcopacy, and where they retain the name "bishop" the authority of the official is regarded as of human bestowment. The parity of the ministry is a fundamental tenet of Lutherans. With rare exceptions (George of Polentz, bishop of Samland (q.v.), and Echard, bishop of Pomerania) the bishops on the Continent, unlike the bishops in England, held aloof from the Reformation. Luther might have had episcopal ordination for the first Lutheran preachers, but, as he distinctly said, he did not want it. He ordained with his own hands the first minister of the new order, his amanuensis, G. Rörer. He pronounced the ministry a matter of expediency, that things may be done in an orderly and decent manner. An officer with supervisory jurisdiction somewhat similar to that of bishop is called in Germany Superintendent (q.v.). The Lutheran Church in Sweden has bishops; a committee was appointed in 1874, by the convention of the Episcopal Church in the

United States, to investigate the validity of its orders, but the convention let the matter drop and no decision was pronounced. There is much doubt concerning the integrity of the succession. Lawrence Peterson was consecrated by Paul Justin, Bishop of Abo, in 1575 Archbishop of Upsala. The evidence for the validity of Justin's consecration is defective. But the confessions of the Swedish Church recognize the equality of the ministry. The bishops of the Church of Denmark have no claim whatever to apostolic succession, although the English bishops of India have recognized Danish ordination. Christian III. in 1536 imprisoned the old bishops; and the new ones whom he appointed were at first called superintendents, and ordained by Bugenhagen.

VIII. The Reformed Churches recognize two orders of the ministry,—presbyters and deacons. They believe that the bishops of the New Testament were identical with presbyters, and deny that the apostles appointed any successors. They do not deny that episcopacy as a matter of expediency may be justifiable; but they do not concede either its divine origin, or the transmission of grace by the imposition of hands, or apostolic succession, in the Anglo-Catholic sense. (Cf. the *Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church*, chaps. iii., v., etc.) Calvin supported episcopacy for Poland and acquiesced in it for England. John Knox divided Scotland into eleven districts, for each of which a "superintendent" was to be chosen; his duties were to be those of a missionary supervisor and the idea of a separate order of the ministry was not thought of.

IX. The American Methodist Episcopal Churches have an episcopacy which is neither diocesan nor hierarchical, but itinerant and presbyterial. The bishops constitute an "itinerant general superintendency," and are "amenable to the body of ministers and preachers," who may divest them of their office. They are not a distinct order of the clergy, but only presbyters. The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States (North) at several of its recent General Conferences has emphatically disavowed that the episcopate is an order; it is only a function. The Methodist Church can not claim apostolic succession if it would. John Wesley after having applied in vain to the Bishop of London to ordain preachers for America, himself ordained the first bishop, Thomas Coke (q.v.), in 1784. The Wesleyan Church in Great Britain has superintendents. The Evangelical Association and the Church of the United Brethren also have an episcopate. Their bishops are elected for a stated period and not for life.

X. The Historic Episcopate is an expression first used in its technical sense by the Protestant Episcopal Church at its Triennial Convention in Chicago, 1886. The expression occurs in a series of four articles adopted by the Convention which were intended to be a basis for the reunion of Christendom. They were reaffirmed by the Pan-Anglican Synod at Lambeth, 1888 (see LAMBETH CONFERENCE). In the communications which passed between the committee appointed by the Triennial Convention and the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States of America, it was found that the expression meant that there is a special order of bishops which goes back to apostolic times and the proposition of union on that basis was declined (cf. the *Minutes of the General Assembly* for 1887, pp. 132–134, 154–156, and for 1880, pp. 93–101; also C. W. Shields, *The Historic Episcopate* (New York, 1894). D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Add to the works cited under BISHOPS and POLITY, ECCLESIASTICAL, J. Reville, *Les Origines de l'épiscopat*, Paris, 1895.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH, REFORMED. See REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

EPISCOPIUS (BISSCHOP), SIMON: Dutch theologian; b. at Amsterdam Jan. 8, 1583; d. there Apr. 4, 1643. For his gifts and industry shown in the schools of Amsterdam the city authorities made him *alumnus*, and sent him to the University of Leyden in 1600. There he became master of arts in 1606 and then began the study of theology under Arminius and Gomarus. When the Amsterdam officials wished to make him preacher there, the Calvinists protested. He went to Franeker and heard Johannes Drusius. In 1610 he became pastor at Bleiswyk, after having declined other calls. He took part on the side of the Remonstrants (q.v.) in the conferences at The Hague (1611) and at Delft (1613). When Gomarus resigned as professor at Leyden the curators nominated Episcopius as his successor and he entered upon his duties as professor there Feb. 23, 1612, with an address *De optima regni Christi instruendi ratione*. During the six years that he held this position he published several works which were collected after his death in his *Opera theologica* (ed. S. Curcellæus and P van Limborch, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1650–65). Festus Hommius, pastor in Leyden, attacked him in *Specimen controversiarum Belgicarum* (Leyden, 1618) and he was once publicly affronted in Amsterdam.

With twelve other Remonstrant ministers Episcopius was cited to appear at the Synod of Dort and he was one of the leaders of the Remonstrants before that body (see DORT, SYNOD OF). He and the others were banished and for a time he lived in Antwerp, then at Paris and in Rouen, until, after the death of Prince Maurice (1625), the animosity against the Remonstrants in his native land began to diminish and he was able to return to Rotterdam (1626). He wrote much during his exile including the *Confessio sive declaratio pastorum qui in foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur* (1622; Dutch transl. by Uytenbogaert, 1621). In Sept., 1630, he consecrated the new Remonstrant church in Amsterdam; in Oct., 1634, he became the head of the newly founded Remonstrant theological seminary there, and filled the position with much honor and renown for nine years, displaying vast energy and exercising a far-reaching influence. In his *Institutiones theologicæ* (left incomplete; published in four volumes, 1650-51) he gave a scientific basis to the doctrines of the Remonstrants, in his *Apologia pro confessione* (1629) he refuted an attack of four Leyden professors upon the

Confessio, and various attacks by Trigland and others received his immediate attention. With no less zeal and success he defended the Protestant faith against the doctrines and practise of the Roman Catholics.

In all his writings Episcopius maintains that theology is not a speculative but a practical science and that every conception of faith is without value when application fails in religious and moral life. But it must be granted that his opponents had some reason to question his orthodoxy. Not only did he combat the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, but in his explanation of the dogmas about the divinity of Christ, the Trinity, and original sin, he deviated from the doctrine of the Reformed Church. None the less his endeavor to free theological science from ecclesiastical constraint broke the way for its independent development. He was one of the greatest theologians of his age and was generally esteemed for his amiable character.

H. C. Rogge†.

Bibliography: P. a Limborch, *Historia vitæ sancti Episcopii*, Amsterdam, 1701; J. Konynenburg, *Lofrede S. Episcopius*, ib. 1791; J. M. Schröck, *Lebensbeschreibung von berühmten Gelehrten*, ii. 182–194, Leipsic, 1790; F. Calder, *Memoirs of S. Episcopius*, London, 1835; H. C. Rogge, *Bibliotheek remonstrantsche geschriften*, pp. 38–47, Amsterdam, 1863.

EPISCOPUS IN PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM. See Bishop, Titular.

EPISTLE: I. The Epistles of the New Testament: Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament has 531 pages of text, of which slightly over one-third is taken up by the Epistles. This is a striking fact, showing that the epistolary element is a significant part of Holy Scripture and decisive for the study of the nature and meaning of revelation and inspiration. Since the New Testament reflects the history and mental perspective of the Christian consciousness out of which it came, it is also certain that letter-writing played a large part in the building and development of the Apostolic Church.

Importance and Significance.

Other facts found in or near the Apostolic Age have similar bearing. The letters to the churches in the Apocalypse of John (chaps. ii. and iii.) are strong evidence. Their existence as an organic part of an apocalypse is, in itself, notable. Christianity took the apocalypse from the Jews. For two centuries it had been in constant use and, like all abiding literary types, had created for itself a traditional mold. The prophetic consciousness of the new religion boldly altered and adapted it. The New Testament apocalyptist takes the letter as a part of his method. His letters are something more than a form; each had a definite address and, like a real letter, takes color from actual and local conditions. This original element in the Christian Apocalypse proves that letter-writing had already played a considerable part in the making of the new religion's fortune; otherwise, the apocalyptist would not have made this use of the epistolary form.

The First Epistle of Clement (95 A.D.?) shows a Christian congregation manifesting a lively interest in the affairs of another. Evidently, correspondence was the means whereby the new religion both expressed and intensified its deep common consciousness. The *Shepherd* of Hermas (100–140 A.D.?) enjoins Clement, the head of the Roman congregation, to send the prophet's outgivings to the other churches. Thus it is evident that the letter satisfied a deep need of primitive Christianity. Religions differ in their power to create a high and sustained common consciousness. It was because the religion of Jesus excelled at this point all competing religions which invaded the Roman Empire in the same period that it eventually conquered. Therefore, the large space within the Scripture canon occupied by the Epistles illumines the history of the Apostolic Church and the nature of the Christian religion.

The Apostolic letters were in large part written before 70 A.D., while three at least of the Gospels were published after that date. Here, again, is a fact significant for the interior history of the Apostolic Church. The publication of the Gospels corresponds to the need which impels a nation to publish and codify its organic law. The building of the Apostolikon (the Epistles) accompanies the founding and building of the Catholic Church, while the publishing of the Gospels indicates the deepening self-consciousness of the Church.

In the founding of the Catholic Church St. Paul played the leading part. It was his ambition as a missionary to evangelize the empire. In the pursuance of that splendid aim he planted churches widely scattered over Asia Minor and Greece, the care of which was on his heart night and day (II Cor. xi. 28). Consequently through letters and the disciples who served him as letter-carriers (Timothy, Epaphroditus, Sylvanus, and others) he kept himself in touch with these outposts and sought to shape their development. It is easy, then, to understand why the Pauline letters constitute the main part of the New Testament Epistles. In the first place they occupy a large part of the space within the canon. Of the 183 pages given to the Epistles in Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament, St. Paul fills 127. In the second place, the Pauline letters are the only real letters in the New Testament. The Catholic Epistles are largely homilies; the Epistle to the Hebrews is a theological treatise, with a small personal element (xiii. 23–25); but the Pauline letters are in large part real letters. The apostle was informed regarding conditions in his churches, and his letters go to the heart of specific problems and needs.

The Epistles of Paul.

St. Paul used the letter as he used the Greek language, with masterly freedom. His salutation is a distinct literary evolution. Compare it with the salutation of James, which is cast in the literary mold of his time. Paul builds up a salutation which becomes an apologetic and doctrinal instrument (Gal. i. 1–5; Rom. i. 1–7). His eager, creative mind reaches forward to his conclusion and greets his correspondents with it.

St. Paul's letters are, in a sense, an autobiography. In them he expresses himself with great freshness, surrendering himself to the matter in hand, taking

color from it while he imposes form upon it. In this way he makes himself the only man of the Apostolic Age who is largely and vitally individual to us and comes before us as a real person. No life of Peter or John can be written which is not mainly generalization and more or less diffuse sermonizing. But a biography of Paul is possible.

HENRY S. NASH.

II. Apocryphal Epistles. See APOCRYPHA, B.

III. Epistles, in the Liturgical Sense. See PERICOPE; and also EVANGELIARIUM; for those in the ecclesiastical sense see COMMENDATORY LETTERS; DECRETALS; ENCYCLICAL LETTERS; LETTERS DIMISSORY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: As an aid to penetrating the internal life of the Apostolic Age through study of the Epistles, consult in general the literature on that period and the works on Introduction to the N. T., especially: E. Renan, *Hist. des origines du christianisme*, 7 vols., Paris, 1863–82, Eng. transl., London, n.d. (brilliant, but the conclusions are to be scanned); E. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.*, Brunswick, 1887, Eng. transl., London, 1890 (somewhat antiquated, yet precise and clear in insight); A. C. McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, New York, 1897 (belongs to the Harnack school); A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N T.*, Tübingen, 1901, Eng. transl., London, 1904 (best for Introduction); J. Moffatt, *Historical N. T.*, Edinburgh, 1901 (handy); E. von Dobschütz, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, Halle, 1904, Eng. transl., London, 1904 (on the religious and social background); P. Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, Tübingen, 1904, Eng. transl., *Beginnings of Christianity*, 2 vols., London, 1903–04 (the doctrinal predominates over the practical and social); W. M. Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, ib. 1905; J. H. Ropes, *The Apostolic Age in the Light of Criticism*, New York, 1906 (best popular work); H. von Soden, *Beginnings of Christianity*, London, 1906.

EPISTOLÆ OBSCURORUM VIRORUM: A series of satirical epistles occasioned by the conflict between Johann Reuchlin (q.v.) and the Dominicans of Cologne in the early years of the sixteenth century. They may be regarded as companion pieces to the *Clarorum virorum epistolæ ad Johannem Reuchlin*, a collection of missives intended to illustrate the support which that great scholar enjoyed among the illustrious men of the time, and to the poem *Triumphus Doctoris Reuchlini*, the authorship of which has been attributed in part to Ulrich von Hutten. The first part of the *Epistolæ* appeared in 1514 under the title *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum ad venerabilem virum Magistrum Ortuinum Gratium*, and comprised forty-one letters which were increased by seven in the third edition, published in 1516. The second part appeared in 1517 under a slightly altered title and contained sixty-two letters, to which eight supplementary letters were added in a second edition. In 1689 both parts were published in an amplified form but the added material possesses no inner connection with the original work. Ortuinus Gratius, to whom the greater number of the letters are addressed, was professor of belles-lettres and philosophy in Cologne after 1506. Devoting his considerable humanistic learning to the service of scholasticism, he drew upon himself the hatred and contempt of the advocates of the new learning, and was characterized by Luther as a "wretched poetaster and a ravening wolf, if not indeed a crocodile." Among the alleged writers of the letters occur a few names of actual personalities, such as Jakob Hochstraten and Arnold von Tongern, but the great majority like Schaffsmulius, Mistladerius, etc., are obviously comic fictions. In form no less than in contents, the *Epistolæ* are a burlesque of the scholastic literature. The debased Latinity of the theologians is cleverly imitated and their ignorance of and contempt for the ancient learning are contrasted with their firm conviction of their own erudition and mental acuteness. Assuming to be puzzled by the most absurd problems of scholarship and theology, the writers address themselves to Ortuinus for a resolution of their doubts. The moral degradation of the clergy is painted at the same time with a broadness of humor that is undeniably contrary to the taste of a more advanced age. References to the dispute between Reuchlin and the Dominicans are to be found in all the letters, and in the second part the first rumblings of the approaching storm of the Reformation may be heard.

In spite of the similarity between the two parts of the *Epistolæ*, the first may be characterized as showing a more restrained fancy and mode of expression and a less evident desire to indulge in satire for the mere joy of destruction. The letters have been assigned, therefore, a double, and, possibly, a triple authorship. The author of the greater number of letters in the first part and the one who conceived the idea of the work was Johann Jäger (called Crotus Rubeanus), who, born at Dornheim in 1480, was educated by the Dominicans, became professor of theology at Cologne in 1506, and rector of the university of Erfurt in 1520. The chief writer of the second part was probably Ulrich von Hutten. To Hutten the work had been attributed from the beginning, but, whereas he indirectly confessed to the authorship of the *Carmen rythmicale* in the second part, he expressly denied all responsibility for the first. The persons attacked in the *Epistolæ* obtained a papal brief against the authors, publishers, and possessors of the book, and carried on a vigorous polemic against the work. It was a *Defensio* by Pfefferkorn that gave occasion to the writing of the second part.

(FERDINAND COHRS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The edition which displaces all others is by E. Böcking, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1864–70, containing text, indexes and commentary; German transl. by M. Binder, Stuttgart, 1876, Eng. transl., London, 1909. Consult D. F. Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten*, pp. 176–211, ib. 1871, Eng transl., London, 1874.

EPONYM: The personage assumed in folk-lore and early history as the ancestor of a clan or race or as the founder of a state or city. The term is a loan-word (Gk. *epōnymos*, "given as a name"), and is much used in modern investigations into the origins of society. It embodies concisely the results of those investigations so far as they involve that the alleged ancestors or founders were fictitious creations formed in the late mythopeic period in response to inquiry into beginnings by the peoples concerned. Thus its use implies that when it was forgotten what were the origins of the Ionians, Eolians, and Acheans, of the Italian peoples and of Rome, Ion, Æolus and Achæus, Italus and Romulus were put forward to account

for the names of the tribes, peoples and city, though modern research has seemed to prove that they had no real existence as persons. While the term eponym and the conclusions of research it expresses have long been commonplaces in secular history, only comparatively recently have they been applied to Biblical history. Here the critical school alone has applied the term and the idea, e.g., to the patriarchs assigned as progenitors of the Hebrew race and of the several tribes. Thus Heber is regarded as an eponym accounting for the Hebrew people, and the same is true of Jacob and Israel and of his twelve sons. The grounds adduced for thus applying the method are various. In general, it is assumed that what is taken as proved for non-Biblical races applies with equal force to the peoples named in the Bible, especially in view of the strong tendency manifest there to etymologize in explaining the names. In particular, the appearance both in Egyptian and in cuneiform documents of such names as *Yaḳob-el* "Jacob is god," *Yoseph-el* "Joseph is god," the occurrence of such names as Gad and Asher as god-names in non-Hebraic sources, and many similar phenomena have been made the basis for extending to Biblical names the principles of explanation regarded as fixed and satisfactory in secular lines of investigation. It hardly needs to be said that the traditional or conservative school of Biblical interpretation repudiates the methods and the results involved GEO. W GILMORE.

EQUITIUS: An early leader of Western monasticism. Our knowledge of him is gained from Gregory the Great, who got his information from personal friends. Of his date the only thing known is that he lived in the beginning and middle of the sixth century. He was abbot of several monasteries in the province of Valeria, near the Lago di Fucino in the Sabine Mountains, and ruled also over certain nunneries. The monks busied themselves with agriculture and in copying ancient manuscripts. Although Equitius was a layman, he preached both in churches and in the streets of the towns and villages through which he made missionary journeys. His itinerant activity led to a conflict with the clergy, who induced the pope (Gregory does not name him) to summon Equitius to Rome; but he changed his mind, it is said, as the result of a terrifying vision—probably in reality through being convinced of the harmlessness of Equitius, who is honored as a saint on Mar. 7.

(G. GRÜTZMACHER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The single source is Pope Gregory I., *Dialogorum libri quattuor*, i., chap. 4, handiest in *MPL*, lxxvii. 147 sqq. Consult *ASB*, March, i. 649–651; C. Baronius, *Annales eccl.*, ad annum 581, nos. 9–12, 12 vols., Rome, 1588–93; E. Spreitzenhofer, *Die Entwicklung des alten Mönchtums in Italien*, Vienna, 1894.

ERA: This word (Lat. *æra* and *era*) denotes a sequence of years reckoned from a definite point of time, wherein every particular year has its fixed position by numerical rotation; and the point of time from which the era proceeds is termed its epoch. The word is first used by Isidore of Seville (q.v.) in the beginning of the seventh century; and attempts have accordingly been made to derive it from the Gothic. It has been correlated with the German *Jahr* and English "year"; but this is not at all certain, and many deem the more probable origin to be from the Latin *æra* (plural of *æs* in the sense of "counters," "reckoning").

The Christian Era.

Among Christian peoples, the era now generally in use is that which has for its epoch the birth of Jesus Christ; that is, the years are reckoned "after the birth of Christ." This era was certainly brought into general use and probably was invented by Dionysius Exiguus (q.v.). That is to say, when (in 525) he was making a continuation of the ninety-five year Easter-table of Cyril of Alexandria from its expiration in the year 531 after Christ, he did not designate the separate years of this Easter cycle, as Cyril had done, as so many years after the Diocletian persecution, but as so many years *ab incarnatione Domini*. He says, "We have been unwilling to connect our cycle with the name of an impious persecutor [Diocletian], but have chosen rather to note the years from the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." For the first year of his computation, Dionysius assumed 754 of the City of Rome according to Varro's calculation, following probably some reckoning already known by his age. By *incarnatio Domini*, however, he understood, consistently with the phraseology then in vogue, not the birth of Jesus, but his conception; that is, the day of the annunciation to Mary (celebrated on Mar. 25; see ANNUNCIATION, FEAST OF THE). At the same time, he did not begin his era with this day, but with the first of January preceding—in other words, with the beginning of the year as it stood accepted in the calendar of Julius Cæsar. Hence "the first of January, 754, of the City of Rome according to Varro," is the epoch of the era of Dionysius. This was afterward misunderstood; *incarnatio* coming to be identified with *nativitas* [and Dec. 25 being the accepted day of Christ's birth (see CHRISTMAS)], people supposed that according to the reckoning of Dionysius, Jesus was born on Dec. 25, 753 A.U.C.—as though Dionysius began his era a week after its proper epoch. Others supposed that Mar. 25, 753, or Dec. 25, 754, was the date of the *incarnatio* according to Dionysius (cf. the works on chronology, e.g., C. L. Ideler, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, ii. 381 sqq. Berlin, 1826).

Consistently with the practise of making *incarnatio* synonymous with *nativitas*, this era was also designated *a nativitate Domini, post Christum natum*, or as now quite generally "after the birth of Christ." Other designations are *anni circumcisionis, anni domini nostri Jesu Christi, anni Christi gratiæ, anni gratiæ*, etc.; still again, *anni salutis, anni orbis redempti*, etc. The designation *anni trabeationis* was doubtless originally intended to signify so many years after Christ's crucifixion, but is also applied to years after the birth of Christ.

It can not be doubted that Jesus was not born in the year 754 A.U.C. Dionysius, or his authority, must have been in error. King Herod, who commanded the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16–18) died 750 A.U.C., and Jesus must surely have been born before the death of Herod. But, if we consider the great difficulties of all chronological calculations, and especially the inadequate auxil-

iary apparatus that was available for Dionysius, no reproach is due him for his mistake. On the other hand, no one can seriously think of attempting to alter the Christian era to accord with the correct date of the birth of Jesus, even if this date could be accurately determined. The era is commended by its convenience, especially since the practise has arisen of reckoning backward as well as forward from its epoch; that is, of dating events before its inception, according to years before the birth of Christ (*ante Christum natum*). This custom came about at a comparatively late date; the well-known historian and chronologer J. C. Gatterer of Göttingen about 1780 dated events before the birth of Christ in "years of the world."

World eras, the epoch of which is the year of the creation of the world, have been prevalent in great number. To mention only two, a rather wide vogue was enjoyed by the world era of Panodorus, who reckoned 5,904 years from Adam to the year 412 A.D. (about which time he lived); his years began with Aug. 29, corresponding to the First of Thoth, or the Egyptian new year. Afterward, this era is usually termed the Antiochian, sometimes the Alexandrian. Its new year was also transferred to Sept. 1, in which case the eight latter months of its year 5493 are the eight former months of the year one of our chronology. More important than this is the Byzantine world era, which long served as the standard of computation in the Eastern Empire, in Russia, among the Albanians, Servians, and Modern Greeks. It counts sixteen years in excess of the Antiochian era, though likewise beginning the year with Sept. 1; its year 5509 began with Sept. 1 of the year one before Christ. This era was in use in Russia till 1700; whence it originated appears not to be known.

Other Eras.

Attempts to compute the year of the creation of the world on the basis of figures supplied in the Old Testament (the ages of the patriarchs, etc.), have been made by chronologists almost down to the present time. Scaliger and Calvisius hold the year one of our era to be the year 3950 from the creation; Petavius, the year 3984; Usher, the year 4004; Frank, 4182. Historians once used one or another of these systems in dating events, especially for the time before Christ; thus Gatterer, mentioned above, computed, in his earlier works, according to the world era of Petavius; in his later ones, according to that of Frank.

Of the eras employed in the Christian Church, two others may be mentioned briefly. The one is the Diocletian, already cited above, which originated in Egypt. Its epoch is the First of Thoth (Aug. 29 of the Julian calendar), of 284 A.D. It numbers the years from the accession of Diocletian, though the first year of Diocletian is not reckoned from the day of his proclamation (Sept. 17), but, in accordance with a generally observed custom, from the new year's day of this year. As this era gained circulation in the Christian Church, it came to be termed, by way of reminder that Diocletian had cruelly persecuted the Christians, *æra martyrum*. The same era continued in observance, to some extent, as late as the eighth century. Besides this, the Spanish era was prevalent in Spain from the beginning of the fifth century, and in particular among the West Goths. Its epoch is the year 716 A.U.C., or 38 B.C. It is used, among others, by Isidore of Seville in his *Historia Gothorum*, and traces of its observance occur into the twelfth century.

All these chronological systems had to yield, step by step, to that of Dionysius; and for a long time past, it has been the custom throughout Christendom to compute in years after (and before) the birth of Christ. In the light of this simple and unequivocal reckoning, it was not advantageous to forego the uniform practise of beginning the year with Jan. 1, as Dionysius had done in agreement with the Roman calendar. As a matter of fact, Jan. 1 appears to have maintained its place as the beginning of the year in civil life everywhere, nor have any calendars been found with a different initial date; moreover, Jan. 1 was named new year's day (see NEW YEAR'S FESTIVAL). Nevertheless other initial dates came into official use; especially Mar. 25 and Dec. 25 were favorite dates for beginning the year in the Middle Ages and down to modern times. [In England the change from Mar. 25 was made by act of 1751.] In the case of Mar. 25, we have still to distinguish between the *calculus Pisanus*, which computed from Mar. 25 before our new year, and the *calculus Florentinus* which computed from Mar. 25 after our new year. Other new year's dates are Mar. 1, Sept. 1, and the Saturday before Easter. Luther computed the year from Dec. 25; so that, for instance, the dating of a letter *die innocentum 1530* denotes, by our mode of reckoning, Dec. 25, 1529. More detailed information as to these new year's dates is to be sought in text-books of chronology; a good synopsis is furnished by H. Grotefend in *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung* (Hanover, 1898), pp. 11 sqq.

The New Year.

CARL BERTHEAU.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the work of Ideler, mentioned in the text, consult Ideler, *Lehrbuch der Chronologie*, Berlin, 1829; H. Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung der deutschen Mittelalter und der Neuzeit*, vols. i.–ii., 2d part, Hanover, 1891–98; idem, *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung*, ib. 1898; F. Ruhl, *Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Berlin, 1897; F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1906. The literature under CHRONOLOGY may also be consulted. A voluminous literature might be cited, but it is composed largely of treatment of special topics bearing not too directly upon the subject.

ERASMUS.

Early Life (§ 1)
Studies and Travels (§ 2).
Basis of Literary Activity (§ 3).
Various Works (§ 4).
Attitude Toward the Reformation (§ 5).
Relations with Luther (§ 6).
Doctrine of the Eucharist (§ 7).
Closing Years (§ 8).

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, Dutch humanist and theologian, was born at Rotterdam, Holland, Oct. 27, probably 1466; d. at Basel, Switzerland, July 12, 1536. Information as to his family and early life comes from a few meager accounts written or suggested by himself at a somewhat advanced age and from many but vague references in his writings at all periods of his life. There

1. Early Life.

seems good reason to believe that the tone of self-pity that pervades all these accounts was assumed for purposes at which one may guess, but as to which one can not be certain. He was doubtless born out of wedlock, well cared for by his parents till their early death, and then given the best education open to a young man of his day in a series of monastic or semimonastic schools. All this early education is made by him in the light of later experience to appear like one long conspiracy to force him into the monastic life, but there is no other evidence for this, and recent criticism has suggested ample motives for his desire to give his life-history this peculiar turn. He was admitted to the priesthood and took the monastic vows at about the age of twenty-five, but there is no record that he ever exercised the priestly functions, and monasticism was one of the chief objects of his attack in his lifelong assault upon the evils of the Church.

Almost immediately after his consecration the way was opened to him for study at the University of Paris, then the chief seat of the later scholastic learning, but already beginning to feel the influence of the revived classic culture of Italy. From this time on Erasmus led the life of an independent scholar, independent of country, of academic ties, of religious allegiance, of everything that could interfere with the free development of his intellect and the freedom of his literary expression. The chief centers of his activity were Paris, Louvain, England, and Basel; yet it could never be said that he was identified with any one of these. His residences in England were fruitful in the making of lifelong friendships with the leaders of English thought in the stirring days of Henry VIII.—John Colet, Thomas More, Thomas Linacre, and William Grocyn. He held at Cambridge an honorable position as Lady Margaret professor of divinity, and there seems to have been no reason except his unconquerable aversion to a routine life, why he should not have spent his days as an English professor. He was offered many positions of honor and profit in the academic world, but declined them all on one or another pretext, preferring the uncertain, but as it proved sufficient rewards of independent literary activity. In Italy he spent three years (1506–09), part of the time in connection with the publishing house of Aldus Manutius at Venice, but otherwise with far less active association with Italian scholars than might have been expected. The residence at Louvain exposed Erasmus to the petty criticism of men nearer to him in blood and political connections, but hostile to all the principles of literary and religious progress to which he was devoting his life. From this lack of sympathy, which he always represented as persecution, he sought refuge in the more congenial atmosphere of Basel, where under the shelter of Swiss hospitality he could express himself with freedom and where he was always surrounded by devoted friends. Here he was associated for many years with the great publisher Froben, and hither came the multitude of his admirers from all quarters of Europe.

2. Studies and Travels.

Erasmus's literary productivity began comparatively late in his life. It was not until he had made himself master of a telling Latin style that he undertook to express himself on all current subjects of literature and religion. His revolt against the forms of Church life did not proceed from any questionings as to the truth of the traditional doctrine, nor from any hostility to the organization of the Church itself. Rather, he felt called upon to use his learning in a purification of the doctrine and in a liberalizing of the institutions of Christianity. He began as a scholar, trying to free the methods of scholarship from the rigidity and formalism of medieval traditions; but he was not satisfied with this. He conceived of himself as, above all else, a preacher of righteousness. It was his lifelong conviction that what was needed to regenerate Europe was sound learning applied frankly and fearlessly to the administration of public affairs in Church and State. It is this conviction that gives unity and consistency to a life which at first sight seems to have been full of fatal contradictions. Erasmus was a marked individual, holding himself aloof from all entangling obligations; yet he was in a singularly true sense the center of the literary movement of his time. In his correspondence he put himself in touch with more than five hundred men of the highest importance in the world of politics and of thought, and his advice on all kinds of subjects was eagerly sought, if none too readily followed.

3. Basis of Literary Activity.

Naturally, Erasmus has been most widely known for his critical and satirical writings, such as the "Praise of Folly" (Paris, 1509) and many of the *Colloquia*, which appeared at intervals from 1500 on. These appeal to a wider audience and deal with matters of wider human interest. Yet their author seems to have regarded them as the trifles of his intellectual product, the play of his leisure hours. His more serious writings begin early with the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, the "Manual (or Dagger) of the Christian Gentleman" (1503). In this little volume Erasmus outlines the views of the normal Christian life which he was to spend the rest of his days in elaborating. The key-note of it all is sincerity. The chief evil of the day, he says, is formalism, a respect for traditions, a regard for what other people think essential, but never a thought of what the true teaching of Christ may be. The remedy is for every man to ask himself at each point: what is the essential thing? and to do this without fear. Forms are not in themselves evil. It is only when they hide or quench the spirit that they are to be dreaded. In his examination of the special dangers of formalism, Erasmus pays his respects to monasticism, saint-worship, war, the spirit of class, the foibles of "society," in the fashion which was to make his later reputation as a satirist, but the main impression of the *Enchiridion* is distinctly that of a sermon. A companion piece to the *Enchiridion* is the *Institutio Principis Christiani* (Basel, 1516), written as advice to the young king Charles of Spain, later the emperor Charles V. Here Erasmus applies the same general principles

4. Various Works.

of honor and sincerity to the special functions of the Prince, whom he represents throughout as the servant of the people. While in England Erasmus began the systematic examination of manuscripts of the New Testament to prepare for a new edition and Latin translation. This edition was published by Froben of Basel in 1516 and was the basis of most of the scientific study of the Bible during the Reformation period (see BIBLE TEXT, II., 2, § 1). It was the first attempt on the part of a competent and liberal-minded scholar to ascertain what the writers of the New Testament had actually said. Erasmus dedicated his work to Pope Leo X. as a patron of learning, to whom such an application of scholarship to religion must be welcome, and he justly regarded this work as his chief service to the cause of a sound Christianity. Immediately after he began the publication of his Paraphrases of the New Testament, a popular presentation of the contents of the several books. These, like all the writings of Erasmus, were in Latin, but they were at once translated into the common languages of the European peoples, a process which received the hearty approval of Erasmus himself.

5. Attitude Toward the Reformation.

The outbreak of the Lutheran movement in the year following the publication of the New Testament brought the severest test of Erasmus's personal and scholarly character. It made the issue between European society and the Roman Church system so clear that no man could quite escape the summons to range himself on one side or the other of the great debate. Erasmus, at the height of his literary fame, was inevitably called upon to take sides, but partizanship in any issue which he was not at liberty himself to define was foreign equally to his nature and his habits. In all his criticism of clerical follies and abuses he had always carefully hedged himself about with protests that he was not attacking church institutions themselves and had no enmity toward the persons of churchmen. The world had laughed at his satire, but only a few obstinate reactionaries had seriously interfered with his activities. He had a right to believe that his work so far had commended itself to the best minds and also to the dominant powers in the religious world. There can be no doubt that Erasmus was in sympathy with the main points in the Lutheran criticism of the Church. For Luther personally he had and expressed the greatest respect, and Luther always spoke with admiration of his superior learning. Luther would have gone to great lengths in securing his cooperation in a work which seemed only the natural outcome of his own. When Erasmus hesitated or refused this seemed to the upright and downright Luther a mean avoidance of responsibility explicable only as cowardice or unsteadiness of purpose, and this has generally been the Protestant judgment of later days. On the other hand the Roman Catholic party was equally desirous of holding on to the services of a man who had so often declared his loyalty to the principles it was trying to maintain, and his half-heartedness in declaring himself now brought upon him naturally the suspicion of disloyalty from this side. Recent judgments of Erasmus, however, have shown how consistent with all his previous practise his attitude toward the Reformation really was. The evils he had combated were either those of form, such as had long been a subject of derision by all sensible men, or they were evils of a kind that could be cured only by a long and slow regeneration in the moral and spiritual life of Europe. Get rid of the absurdities, restore learning to its rights, insist upon a sound practical piety, and all these evils would disappear: this was the programme of the "Erasmian Reformation." No one could question its soundness or its desirability. Its fatal lack was that it failed to offer any tangible method of applying these principles to the existing church system. This kind of reform had been tried long enough, and men were impatient of further delay. When Erasmus was charged—and very justly—with having "laid the egg that Luther hatched" he half admitted the truth of the charge, but said he had expected quite another kind of a bird.

6. Relations with Luther.

In their early correspondence Luther expressed in unmeasured terms his admiration for all Erasmus had done in the cause of a sound and reasonable Christianity, and exhorted him now to put the seal upon his work by definitely casting in his lot with the Lutheran party. Erasmus replied with many expressions of regard, but declined to commit himself to any party attitude. His argument was that to do so would endanger his position as a leader in the movement for pure scholarship which he regarded as his real work in life. Only through that position as an independent scholar could he hope to influence the reform of religion. The constructive value of Luther's work was mainly in furnishing a new doctrinal basis for the hitherto scattered attempts at reform. In reviving the half forgotten principle of the Augustinian theology Luther had furnished the needed impulse to that personal interest in religion which is the essence of Protestantism. This was precisely what Erasmus could not approve. He dreaded any change in the doctrine of the Church and believed that there was room enough within existing formulas for the kind of reform he valued most. Twice in the course of the great discussion he allowed himself to enter the field of doctrinal controversy, a field foreign alike to his nature and his previous practise. One of the topics formally treated by him was the freedom of the will, the crucial point in the whole Augustinian system. In his *De libero arbitrio Διατρίβη sive collatio* (1524), he analyzes with great cleverness and in perfect good temper the Lutheran exaggeration, as it seemed to him, of the obvious limitations upon human freedom. As his habit was, he lays down both sides of the argument and shows that each had its element of truth. His position was practically that which the Church had always taken in its dealing with the problem of sin: that Man was bound to sin, but that after all he had a right to the forgiving mercy of God, if only he would seek this through the means offered him by the Church itself. It was an easy-going Semi-Pelagianism, humane in its practise, but opening the way to those very laxities and perversions which Eras-

mus and the Reformers alike were combating. The "Diatribe," clever as it was, could not lead men to any definite action, and this was precisely its merit to the Erasmians and its offense to the Lutherans.

As the popular response to the Lutheran summons become more marked and more widely spread, the social disorders which Erasmus dreaded began to appear. The Peasants' War, the Anabaptist disturbances in Germany and in the Low Countries (see ANABAPTISTS), iconoclasm and radicalism everywhere, seemed to confirm all his gloomy predictions. If this were to be the outcome of reform, he could only be thankful he had kept out of it. On the other hand, he was being ever more bitterly accused of having started the whole "tragedy." In Switzerland he was especially exposed to criticism through his association with men there who were more than suspected of extreme rationalistic doctrines. On this side the test question was naturally the doctrine of the sacraments, and the *crux* of this question was the observance of the Eucharist. Partly to clear himself of suspicion and partly in response to demands that he should write something in defense of Catholic doctrine, he published in 1530 a new edition of the orthodox treatise of Algerus against the heretic Berengar of Tours in the eleventh century. He added a dedication in which he affirms positively his belief in the reality of the body of Christ after consecration in the Eucharist, but admits that the precise form in which this mystery ought to be expressed is a matter on which very diverse opinions have been held by good men. Enough, however, for the mass of Christians that the Church prescribes the doctrine and the usages that embody it, while the refinements of speculation about it may safely be left to the philosophers. Here and there in many vehement utterances on this subject Erasmus lays down the principle, quite unworthy of his genius and his position of influence: that a man may properly have two opinions on religious subjects, one for himself and his intimate friends and another for the public. The antisacramentarians, headed by Œcolampadius of Basel, were, as Erasmus says, quoting him as holding views about the Eucharist quite similar to their own. He denies this with great heat, but in his denial betrays the fact that he had in private conversation gone just as far toward a rational view of the doctrine of the Eucharist as he could without a positive formulation in words. Naturally here, as in the case of free will, he could not command the approval of the Church he was trying to placate.

7. Doctrine of the Eucharist.

Thus, as the visible outcome of his reformatory activities Erasmus found himself at the close of his life at odds with both the great parties. His last years were embittered by controversies with men toward whom he was drawn by many ties of taste and sympathy. Notable among these was his passage at arms with Ulrich von Hutten (q.v.), a brilliant, but erratic genius, who had thrown himself with all his heart into the Lutheran cause and had declared that Erasmus, if he had a spark of honesty about him, would do the same. In his reply, *Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni* (1523), he displays, better than almost anywhere else, his skill in twisting words and phrases to suit the purpose of the moment. He accuses Hutten of having misinterpreted his utterances about reform and reiterates his determination never to take sides in the division of parties. When the city of Basel was definitely and officially "reformed" in 1529, Erasmus gave up his residence there and settled in the imperial town of Freiburg-im-Breisgau. It would seem as if he found it easier to maintain his neutrality under Roman Catholic than under Protestant conditions. His literary activity continued without much abatement, chiefly on the lines of religious and didactic composition. The most important work of this last period is the *Ecclesiastes* or "Gospel Preacher" (Basel, 1535), in which he brings out the function of preaching as the most important office of the Christian priest, an emphasis which shows how essentially Protestant his inner thought of Christianity was. The same impression comes from his little tract of 1533 on "Preparation for Death," in which the emphasis throughout is on the importance of a good life as the essential condition of a happy death. For unknown reasons Erasmus found himself drawn once more to the happiest of his homes, at Basel, and returned thither in 1535 after an absence of six years. Here, in the midst of the group of Protestant scholars who had long been his truest friends, and, so far as is known, without relations of any sort with the Roman Catholic Church, he died. So long as he lived he had never been called to account for his opinions by any official authority of the dominant Church. The attacks upon him were by private persons, and his protectors had always been men of the highest standing. After his death, in the zeal of the Roman Catholic reaction, his writings were honored with a distinguished place on the Index of prohibited books, and his name has generally had an evil sound in Roman Catholic ears. The extraordinary popularity of his books, however, has been shown in the immense number of editions and translations that have appeared from the sixteenth century until now, and in the undiminished interest excited by his elusive but fascinating personality.

8. Closing Years.

EPHRAIM EMERTON.

[Ten columns of the catalogue of the library in the British Museum are taken up with the bare enumeration of the works translated, edited or annotated by Erasmus, and their subsequent reprints. It is a remarkable showing. The greatest names of the classical and patristic world are included, such as Ambrose, Aristotle, Augustine, Basil, Chrysostom, Cicero, and Jerome.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The works were edited by Erasmus's friend Beatus Rhenatus, 9 vols., Basel, 1540, and by Le Clerc, 10 vols., Leyden, 1703–06. The best edition of the *Epistles* is by P. S. Allen, vol. i., Oxford, 1906, with which should be put *Briefe an Desiderius Erasmus*, ed. L. K. Enthoven, Strasburg, 1906; an Eng. transl. of the *Epistles* , *to his Fifty-first Year, Arranged in Order of Time*, by F. M. Nichols, appeared, 2 vols., London, 1901–1904. His *Colloquies* are in Eng. transl. by N. Bailey, ib. 1878; his *Praise of Folly*, with his *Letter to Sir Thomas More* and a *Life* is in a handy ed., ib. 1876; his *Enchiridion militis Christiani* is in Eng. transl., ib. 1905, cf. *The Christian's Manual. Compiled from the Enchiridion*, by

P. W. Crowther, ib. (1816); the *Apothegms of Erasmus Transl. into Eng. by Nicolas Udall, 1564* was reprinted, Boston, England, 1877; there is a school ed. of the *Conviviale conloquiis*, by V S. Clark, Boston, 1896. The most complete bibliography is found in *Bibliotheca Erasmiana, répertoire des œuvres d'Érasme*, Ghent, 1893. Consult also *Bibliotheca Erasmiana*, Ghent, 1903, J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, III. i. 194–196.

On the life consult: F. O. Stichart, *Erasmus*, Leipsic, 1870; H. Durand de Laur, *Érasme, précurseur et initiateur de l'esprit moderne*, 2 vols., Paris, 1872; R. B. Drummond, *Erasmus, his Life and Character*, 2 vols., London, 1873; G. Feugère, *Érasmus; étude sur sa vie et ses ouvrages*, Paris, 1874; J. Meiklejohn, *The Reformers*, Glasgow, 1885; F. Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers*, London, 1887; M. Dods, *Erasmus and Other Essays*, ib. 1891; J. A. Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus*, New York, 1896; P. de Nolhac, *Érasme en Italie. Étude sur un épisode de la renaissance, . douze lettres inédites d'Érasme*, Paris, 1898; E. Emerton, *Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam*, New York, 1899; A. R. Pennington, *The Life and Character of Erasmus*, London, 1901; E. F. H. Capey, *Erasmus*, New York, 1903; W. H. Woodward, *Desiderius Erasmus concerning the Aim and Method of Education*, Cambridge, 1904; J. A. Faulkner, *Erasmus the Scholar*, Cincinnati, 1907.

ERASMUS, SAINT. See Helpers in Need, the Fourteen.

ERASTUS, THOMAS, ERASTIANISM: Swiss Reformed physician and theologian; b. probably at Baden (14 m. n.w. of Zurich), Switzerland, Sept. 7, 1524; d. at Basel Jan. 1, 1583. The name is Grecised from Lüber or Lieber. He studied theology at Basel and philosophy and medicine for nine years at Bologna and Padua. In 1558 he became physician in ordinary to the elector Palatine, Otto Henry, and professor of medicine at Heidelberg. In 1580 he went to Basel as professor of medicine and became also professor of ethics shortly before his death. He was considered a good physician and upright man, and established a foundation for the education of poor students in medicine at Basel and Heidelberg. As a student of nature he strenuously opposed the astrology, alchemy, and magic of Paracelsus and his school, though he approved of the death penalty for witches. It is as a theologian, however, that he is known and remembered. He was a follower of Zwingli, took an active part in the conferences at Heidelberg (1560) and at Maulbronn (1564), and defended the Swiss view of the Lord's Supper in a book *Vom Verstand der Wort Christi: Das ist mein Leib*, and again in a vindication of this work against Johann Marbach, a Lutheran minister of Strasburg (Heidelberg, 1565). Some years later he had occasion to defend his master's ideas against the Calvinists in a question of church polity. There was a Calvinist party in Heidelberg, headed by Caspar Olevianus (q.v.), which wanted to introduce a purely Presbyterian constitution, with a corresponding church discipline. Erastus strongly opposed the movement, but in vain. He was himself the first victim of the established discipline, being excommunicated on a charge of latent Unitarianism; after five years, however, he was restored.

Six years after his death G. Castelvetro, who had married his widow, published a work, written in 1568 and found among his papers, *Explicatio gravissimæ quæstionis utrum excommunicatio mandato nitatur divino an excogitata sit ab hominibus* (Poschiavo, 1589). The book, written after the fashion of the time in the form of theses, denies that excommunication is a divine ordinance, or that the Church has any power to make laws or decrees; and asserts that to inflict pains and penalties and to punish the sins of professing Christians belongs to the civil magistrates, not to pastors and elders. It attracted much attention and was attacked by Beza. English translations appeared at London in 1659 and 1682, and again, by R. Lee, at Edinburgh, 1844. Its views were adopted by a distinct party in the Westminster Assembly, headed by Selden, Lightfoot, Coleman, and Whitelocke. Since that time the doctrine of state supremacy in ecclesiastical causes generally goes under the name of Erastianism; though in its broad sense and wide application this doctrine is by no means due to Erastus or in accord with his views.

Bibliography: C. F. Vierordt, *Geschichte der Reformation im Grossherzogthum Baden*, pp. 456 sqq., Carlsruhe, 1847; A. Bonnard, *Thomas Éraste et la discipline ecclésiastique*, Lausanne, 1894. For Erastianism consult: J. Selden's *Table Talk*, reprinted Oxford, 1892, and his *Hist. of Tythes*, London, 1629. The extreme form of the doctrine is found in T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, iii. 42, good edition, Oxford, 1881. Consult also R. I. Wilberforce, *Sketch of the Hist. of Erastianism*, London, 1851.

ERBKAM, erb'kām, **WILHELM HEINRICH:** Councilor of the consistory and professor of theology at Königsberg, Prussia; b. at Glogau (35 m. n.n.w. of Liegnitz), Silesia, July 8, 1810; d. at Königsberg Jan. 9, 1884. He studied at Bonn, where he was chiefly influenced by Nitzsch and Bleek, and at Berlin where he was still more strongly and decisively influenced by Schleiermacher, with whom he was fortunate enough to come into close personal contact. Under Neander's guidance he devoted himself to the study of church history, and Marheineke introduced him to a closer study of systematic theology. In 1834 he went to the theological seminary at Wittenberg, where he made further progress in practical theology under the guidance of Rothe, at that time director of the seminary. Rothe guided his theological activity by directing his attention especially to Protestant mysticism and the sects proceeding from it. In 1838 Erbkam established himself as privat-docent in theology at Berlin, where he finally became professor and remained ten years, lecturing at first chiefly on the history of dogma and later on church history and systematic disciplines. During these years he was active also in the practical life of the Church, especially in preaching. He defended the full and whole truth of the revelation of the Gospel against the rationalistic unbelief and the half-believing theology of the Friends of Light (see Free Congregations in Germany, § 1), who about 1840 protested against faithfulness to the Bible and the confession in the church as orthodox darkness, and attacked especially the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* and its editor, E. W. Hengstenberg. In 1847 Erbkam followed a call to Königsberg, where he taught church history and history of dogma, and subsequently exegesis, dogmatics, ethics, and symbolics. In 1857 he became councilor of the consistory of Königsberg and was also chosen representative of the theological faculty at the general synods of 1875 and

1879. His principal work is *Die Geschichten der protestantischen Sekten im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Hamburg, 1848). (DAVID ERDMANN†.)

ERDMANN, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH DAVID: German Protestant; b. at Güstebiese, near Königsberg, July 28, 1821; d. at Dresden Mar. 11, 1905. He studied in Berlin (1843–1847), and in 1853 became privat-docent in theology there. In 1856 he went to Königsberg as professor of theology, and in 1864, to Breslau as general superintendent for Silesia, being at the same time honorary professor at the University of Breslau. He retired from active life in 1900. He wrote *Leben und Leiden der ersten Christen* (Berlin, 1854); *Prima Joannis epistolæ argumentum, nexus et consilium* (1855); *Die Reformation und ihre Märtyrer in Italien* (1855); *Der Brief des Jakobus erklärt* (1881); *Luther und die Hohenzollern* (Breslau, 1883); and *Luther und seine Beziehungen zu Schlesien, insbesondere zu Breslau* (Halle, 1887). He likewise contributed the section on the books of Samuel to J. P. Lange's *Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk* (Bielefeld, 1873; Eng. transl. by C. H. Toy and J. A. Broadus, New York, 1877).

ERDÖSI JÁNOS. See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, X, § 1.

EREMITE. See HERMIT.

ERFURT, BISHOPRIC OF: A Thuringian bishopric established by Boniface in the summer of 741 with its seat at Erfurt. Previous to the erection of this see, Thuringia alone of the German stocks had had no bishopric of its own, being under the jurisdiction of Mainz. The first bishop of Erfurt seems to have been Dadanus, who was one of those present at the Austrasian Synod of 742, and he was apparently succeeded by Boniface himself. Whether this took place before or after Boniface became archbishop of Mainz is uncertain, but at all events it explains the later association of Thuringia and Mainz. (A. HAUCK.)

From the time of Boniface till the fourteenth century, episcopal acts in the Erfurt district were performed either by the archbishops of Mainz or by visiting bishops delegated for the occasion; but from 1313 to 1807 there was a regular line of coadjutors to the archbishop with their seat at Erfurt. A papal bull of 1821 placed Erfurt under the see of Paderborn.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Rettberg, *KD*, i. 351–352; Hauck, *KD*, i. 513–514; *KL*, iv. 770–772.

ERIGENA, JOHN SCOTUS. See SCOTUS, ERIGENA JOHANNES.

ERMLAND, BISHOPRIC OF: A German bishopric established in 1243 by the papal legate William of Modena, together with the sees of Culm, Pomesania, and Samland. The cathedral was founded at Braunsberg (30 m. s.w. of Königsberg) by Anselm, the first bishop, in June, 1260, but twenty years later was transferred to Frauenburg (41 m. s.w. of Königsberg) by Henry I. Among the famous bishops of this diocese was Æneas Silvius Piccolomini (1457–58), afterward Pope Pius II. (A. HAUCK.)

Until 1525 the diocese was under the political jurisdiction of the Teutonic order. Toward the end of this period it increased in importance; the attempt of the Diet of Lublin (1506) to have it established as the metropolitan see of the Prussian dioceses failed indeed, but in 1512 Julius II. released it from its nominal subordination to the archbishopric of Riga and constituted it an "exempt" bishopric. From 1525 to 1772 it was under Polish jurisdiction, and the bishops were of that nationality beginning with the celebrated Stanislaus Hosius (1551–79; see HOSIUS, STANISLAUS), who was one of the presidents of the Council of Trent. After 1772 it was under Prussian rule. The bull *De salute* of 1821 united with it the diocese of Samland and five deaneries of Pomesania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Monumenta hist. Warmiensis*, ed. C. P. Wölky and J. N, Saage, Mainz, 1858 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, iv. 653.

ERNEST THE CONFESSOR AND THE REFORMATION IN BRUNSWICK-LUENEBURG: Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg, known as "the Confessor;" b. at Uelzen (20 m. s.s.e. of Lüneburg) June 26, 1497; d. at Celle Jan. 11, 1546. In 1512 he was sent to the court of his mother's brother, the elector Frederick the Wise, at Wittenberg, and received instruction there from Georg Spalatin; he remained at Wittenberg through the beginning of the Reformation. In 1520 his father, Henry, associated with himself in the government his two sons, Otto and Ernest, and abdicated the same year. By the retirement of Otto in 1527 Ernest became sole ruler. The condition of his domain was not prosperous. Political considerations doubtless furthered the introduction of the Reformation; it offered opportunity to restrict the privileges of the nobles and the clergy and to increase the revenues from church and monastery property. The forerunner of the Reformation in Lüneburg was a certain Wolf Cyclop, a physician from Zwickau, who was not free from the Zwickau enthusiasm (see ZWIKAU PROPHETS). Saner men followed him, such as Gottschalk Cruse, Heinrich Bock, and Matthäus Mylow. Ernest was inclined to move slowly, but in 1525 the Peasants' War gave him occasion to call upon the monasteries for lists of their property and to require them to admit Protestant preachers; he promised the elector of Saxony to stand by the Protestant cause. After an attempt of the Roman Catholic party to reinstate his father in 1527 had failed, his course became more decided. In July, 1527, the first book of discipline was adopted, drawn up by the preachers of Celle. At a diet in August of the same year it was ordered that "God's pure word should be preached everywhere without additions made by men." Between 1527 and 1530 Lutheran preachers were introduced in most parishes, and into the monasteries, not in all cases without compulsion. Ernest went to Augsburg in 1530 and signed the Confession. He brought back Urbanus Rhegius (q.v.), who worked for the spread of the Reformation (after 1541 as superintendent) and introduced it into the city of Lüneburg. The largest and richest monastery in the land, St. Michael's in Lüneburg, accepted the new order after the death of Abbot Boldewin in 1532. Rhe-

gius died in 1541 and was succeeded by Martin Ondermark, who completed the former's work.

In general it may be said that the preachers were well disposed to the reformed religion, while the people held to the old and only gradually adapted themselves to the new. During the Schmalkald War the land remained true to the Gospel. After 1530 Ernest was the most influential prince of North Germany. He sent Rhegius to Hanover when the Reformation there threatened to become revolution and restored order. In the cities of Westphalia he strengthened the Protestant party against both the Roman Catholics and the enthusiasts, although his efforts were vain in Münster. His influence was also felt in Pommerania and Mecklenburg, in Hoya, and in East Friesland. His most effective work probably was accomplished by his restless activity for the Schmalkald League. He induced the North German cities, Hamburg, Bremen, Brunswick, Göttingen, and others to join, and he often became the successful mediator when a rupture was threatened between the overcautious elector of Saxony and the headstrong Philip of Hesse. While Ernest sometimes used harsh measures to accomplish his will, and was actuated by a desire to exalt his position as ruler as well as by higher motives, yet, on the whole, he was faithful to his motto, *aliis inserviendo consumor*. His four sons at his death were still minors, but the Protestant Church of Lüneburg was so firmly established that it could survive the regency and the unhappy time of the Schmalkald War, and to this day the church life of Lüneburg bears the character impressed upon it by Ernest the Confessor.

(G. Uhlhorn†.)

Bibliography: J. G. Bertram, *Das Leben Ernesti*, Brunswick, 1719; J. K. F. Schlegel, *Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte von Norddeutschland und Hannover*, vol. ii., Hanover, 1829; W. Havemann, *Geschichte der Lande Braunschweig und Lüneburg*, vol. ii., Göttingen, 1855; lives of Urbanus Rhegius by H. C. Heimbürger, Gotha, 1851, and G. Uhlhorn, Elberfeld, 1861; A. Wrede, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Lüneburg durch Herzog Ernst den Bekenner*, Göttingen, 1887; G. Uhlhorn, in *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen*, Hanover, 1897, pp. 22 sqq.; *ADB*, iv. 260 sqq.

ERNEST, ELECTOR OF COLOGNE. See Gebhard II.

ERNEST I., THE PIOUS: Duke of Saxe-Gotha and Altenburg; b. at the castle of Altenburg (26 m. s. of Leipsic) Dec. 25, 1601; d. Mar. 26, 1675. Early left an orphan, he was brought up in a strict manner, and gifted and precocious, but not physically strong, he soon showed traits of the piety of the time. As ruler, by his character and governmental ability as well as by personal attention to matters of state, he introduced a golden time for his subjects after the ravages of the Thirty Years' War. By a wise economy, which did not exclude fitting generosity or display on proper occasions, he freed his land from debt, left at his death a considerable sum in the treasury, and reduced taxation. The public security and an incorruptible and efficient judiciary received much of his care, and his regulations served as models for other states. He did not rise far enough above his time to do away with torture, though he restricted it, and in the century of trials for witchcraft he yielded to the common delusion, though otherwise not inclined to superstition and a foe of alchemy. He prohibited dueling and imposed the death penalty for a mortal result.

His laws were not conceived in the spirit of modern ideas about individual liberty; they forbade secret betrothals, tried to regulate dress, and extended even to the stable, kitchen, and cellar. Nevertheless his regulations promoted agriculture, commerce, learning, and art. His palace of Friedenstein in Gotha was rebuilt, and its collections owe their origin to Ernest; the library became one of the largest in Germany. Churches were built and by his *Schulmethodus* of 1642 Ernest became the father of the present grammar-school. It was a popular saying that his peasants were better instructed than the townsmen and nobles elsewhere, and at his death, it was said, no one in his land was unable to read and write. He made the gymnasium in Gotha a model school which attracted pupils not only from all German lands, but from Sweden, Russia, Poland, and Hungary. In like manner he fostered the university at Jena, increasing its funds and regulating its studies, with too much emphasis on the religious side. The same fault attaches to his efforts in church affairs, which won him the name of "Praying Ernest"; but an excuse is found in the fearful demoralization caused by the war. The Bible was his own everyday book and he strove unceasingly to make his people religious after a strict Lutheran pattern. Religious instruction, consisting in catechetical exercises without Bible history, was kept up even to advanced years and not unnaturally the rigid compulsion in some cases defeated its purpose. Ernest's system has maintained itself surprisingly; it still exists legally though somewhat modified or disregarded.

His efforts for Protestantism were not confined to his own land. He interceded with the emperor for his Austrian coreligionists, and wanted to establish them in Gotha. He became a benefactor to the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Germans in Moscow and entered into friendly relations with the Czar. He even sent an embassy to introduce Lutheranism into Abyssinia, but failed to accomplish his purpose. His rule of his family is a miniature of his government of his land. The strictest discipline prevailed at court. Its life was simple and industrious, regu ated on all sides by religious exercises. Rules were added to rules. No detail was overlooked which could promote the spiritual and physical development of his children, and their religious education was carried to excess. Nevertheless his children all turned out well and Ernest died with the name of "father and savior of his people." Oliver Cromwell counted him among the most sagacious of princes; in him was embodied "the idea of the Protestant patriarchal prince and of a Christian governor of State and Church truly caring for both." For the edition of the Bible which he planned (the so-called "Ernestine Bible") see Bibles, Annotated, and Bible Summaries, I, § 1.

Georg Loesche.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the life consult: J. H. Gelbke, *Herzog Ernst I. genannt der Fromme*, 3 vols., Gotha, 1810; A. Beck, *Ernst der Fromme*, 2 vols., Weimar, 1865; idem, in *ADB*, vi. 302–308. For the educational work: W. Böhme, *Das Informationswerk Ernst des Frommen von Gotha*, Leipsic, 1885; idem, *Die Erziehung der Kinder Ernst des Frommen von Gotha*, Chemnitz, 1887; idem, *Die pädagogischen Bestrebungen Ernst des Frommen*, Gotha, 1888; A. Braem, *Der gothaische Schulmethodus*, Berlin, 1897.

ERNESTI, JOHANN AUGUST: Professor of theology at Leipsic; b. at Tennstädt (15 m. n.n w. of Erfurt), Thuringia, Aug. 4, 1707; d. at Leipsic Sept. 11, 1781. His father was preacher and superintendent in Electoral Saxony. In 1727 he began the study of mathematics, philosophy, and theology at Wittenberg. After two years he became tutor at Leipsic, in the house of Stieglitz, councilor of war and mayor, whose influence upon his future career became decisive. In 1731 he was made vice-principal and in 1734 principal of the school of St. Thomas, at the same time lecturing with great success on the Latin classics at the university. In 1742 he was appointed professor extraordinary of humane literature and in 1756 received the important chair of professor of eloquence. His orations, distinguished by their versatile Latin, won him the title of "Cicero of the Germans." In 1759 he was transferred to the theological faculty. He was an excellent teacher and became a leading personality in the university and town. His nature was receptive; he perceived the defects in methods of instruction, but he lacked thoroughness, while his interest in the subject-matter and the beauties of form caused him to underrate the value of penetrating criticism.

As Professor and Teacher.

Ernesti's importance as a theologian is intelligible from his personal development and the conditions of his time. After the change of confession on the part of the sovereign and the court, the Lutheran church of Saxony had organized itself in a more independent way, and its churchly life had a secure basis in the confessions of the Reformation. But, owing to Pietism and the criticism of rationalism, the scholastic method in theology had to give way to the historical. Ernesti was governed by the new spirit. As a well-trained philologist he perceived the defects of a dogmatic exegesis and the insufficiencies of a merely empirical method of Biblical criticism. On the other hand, he was deeply penetrated by a love of the Church whose confessional foundations he regarded as unshakable, at least in the attenuated dogmatics of his time. Thus he maintained on the one side that the Bible must be explained like any other book, but on the other hand, as a dogmatician, he clung to tradition. He was not conscious of trying to harmonize two irreconcilable principles in his scientific and churchly thinking; and just because as a theologian of the Church he was able to satisfy the demands of philological criticism by his clear formulas, without infringing upon churchly authority, his work denotes a turning-point in the development of theological science. By his happy inconsistency he secured an indisputable place for historical criticism in theology.

As Theologian.

He laid down his principles in his *Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti* (Leipsic, 1761; Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1834). In opposition to the mystical and allegorical interpretation of Cocceius and to unhistorical rationalism he showed that Scripture possesses only one sense. The work of the interpreter is finished with the establishment of the grammatical or literal sense, i.e., with historical explanation, the means of which are furnished by the science of language. He controverts his own principles, however, by making the positive results of Scriptural interpretation dependent upon the immediate inspiration of the Bible, and the same contradictions appear in his dogmatic works.

In general Ernesti strove to be a Biblical theologian who bases his faith upon the grammatical interpretation of Scripture. He rendered great services by showing that Biblical philological interpretation as such may claim an independent position in theology. By his deep studies of the Bible he avoided rationalism, Pietism, and dead orthodoxy. But he shrank from any thoroughgoing innovation which might in any way interfere with the traditions of churchly life. To increase his influence on the theology of his time he founded the *Theologische Bibliothek*, which appeared in two series (1760–69 and 1773–79), writing himself most of the contributions. His editions of Cicero, Homer, Xenophon, Tacitus, and other classical authors were famous, and his *Opuscula oratoria* (Leipsic, 1762), *Opuscula philologico-critica* (1764), and *Initia doctrinæ solidioris* (1736) were much read. His sermons have an academic stamp; their language is cumbrous, and he thinks in Latin, though he writes in German.

(G. HEINRICI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W A. Teller, *Verdienste Ernestis um Theologie und Religion*, Berlin, 1783, and the *Zusätze* to Teller by J. S. Semler, Halle, 1783; J. van Voorst, *Oratio de Ernestio*, Leyden, 1805; C. H. Frotscher, *Eloquentium virorum narrationes*, i. 81–129, Leipsic, 1826.

ERNESTINE BIBLE. See BIBLES, ANNOTATED, AND BIBLE SUMMARIES, I, § 1.

ERPENIUS (VAN ERPE), THOMAS: Dutch Arabist; b. at Gorkum (22 m. e.s.e. of Rotterdam) Sept. 7, 1584; d. at Leyden Nov. 13, 1624. He studied at Middelburg and Leyden, and then traveled through France, Germany, Italy, and England. Almost immediately after his return, he was appointed professor of Oriental languages at Leyden (Feb., 1613). In addition to his academic activity, his position as royal interpreter kept him in constant touch with the East. His entrance on his professorship was signalized by the publication of his *Grammatica arabica* (Leyden, 1613), which, like its summary, the *Rudimenta linguæ arabicæ* (1620), went through many editions and was not superseded until the works of De Sacy appeared, two centuries later. After the death of his patron Josef Scaliger, Erpenius published a posthumous edition of the latter's *Proverbiorum Arabicorum centuriæ duæ* (1614), while his duties as a teacher resulted in his publication of the first edition of the fables

of Lokman in his *Locmani sapientis fabulæ* (1615). In 1615 he also published his *Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos epistola, Arabice,* which he followed in the next year with his *Novum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum, Arabice* (1616). The Gospels were based in general on the Greek text, Acts and the Epistles on the Peshito, and Revelation on a Coptic source. In 1619 Erpenius was appointed professor of Hebrew, and now edited his *Pentateuchus Mosis, Arabice* (1622), which, however, like his *Grammatica Ebræa generalis* (1621), possesses but a minor importance. His edition of the Christian Arabic historian Ibn al-Amid al-Makin was completed by J. Golius (*Historia Saracenica auctore Georgio Elmacino,* 1625), and in the year after his death appeared his *Psalmi Davidis, Syriace* (1625), while C. l'Empereur edited his *Grammatica Chaldæa et Syrica* (Amsterdam, 1628). (A. Socin†.)

Bibliography: P. Scriverius, "*Manes Erpeniani,*" Leyden, 1625; Ersch and Gruber, section 1, xxxvii. 359–360.

ERRETT, ISAAC: Disciple of Christ; b. in New York City Jan. 2, 1820; d. at Cincinnati, O., Dec. 19, 1888. He was self-educated from his tenth year, and after laboring as a farmer, miller, lumberman, bookseller, printer, school-teacher, pastor, preacher, and editor, became one of the leading men of his denomination. He was associate editor of *The Millennial Harbinger* with Alexander Campbell, and from 1866 until his death was editor-in-chief of the denominational organ, *The Christian Standard,* published in Cincinnati. His writings include *First Principles; or, The Elements of the Gospel* (Cincinnati, 1867); *Walks about Jerusalem: A Search after the Landmarks of Primitive Christianity* (1872); *Talks to Bereans* (1875); *Letters to a Young Christian* (1881); *Evenings with the Bible* (3 vols., 1885–88); *Life and Writings of George Edward Flower* (1885); and *Our Position: A Brief Statement of the Plea urged by the People known as Disciples of Christ* (1885).

Bibliography: J. S. Lamar, *Memoirs of Isaac Errett, with Selections from his Writings,* Pottsville, 1894.

ERSKINE, EBENEZER: Founder of the Scottish Secession Church (see Presbyterians); b. at Dryburgh (30 m. s.e. of Edinburgh), Berwickshire, June 22, 1680; d. at Stirling June 2, 1754. His father, Henry Erskine an English non-conformist minister (ejected by the Act of Uniformity, 1662; after the Revolution minister of Chirnside, Berwickshire; d. 1696), belonged to the family of the earls of Mar. His mother, Margaret Halcro of Orkney, claimed as ancestor the duke of Albany, son of James V of Scotland. Both parents were distinguished by piety and holy living. The son inherited their more valuable qualities and somewhat of the high spirit not unbecoming the noble blood which flowed in his veins. He studied at the University of Edinburgh (M.A., 1697), and was licensed and ordained minister of Portmoak, Kinrossshire, in 1703. In 1704 he married Alison Turpie, whose religious experience and devout spirit were the means of giving him his first real "view of salvation." In 1731 he was translated to the more important charge of Stirling, which he occupied till his deposition from the ministry of the Church of Scotland, in 1740.

As a minister of the national church, no less than after his secession, Erskine's labors were abundant and successful. Few ministers of that day enjoyed greater popularity as a preacher. People came from distances of sixty or seventy miles to benefit by his ministrations; and at the dispensation of the communion it was sometimes found necessary, even in the small parish of Portmoak, to make provision for no fewer than 2,000 participants. His discourses were plain, even homely in style, but were delivered with a certain elevation and dignity of manner which were always characteristic of him.

But it is chiefly as a leader in ecclesiastical affairs, at a critical period of the history of the Church of Scotland, that Erskine was known in his own day, and is remembered. For the full history of the secession of 1733, see Presbyterians. Of this first considerable division in the Scottish Church, Erskine is admitted to have been the prime mover. The immediate occasion of the rupture was an act of the General Assembly of 1732, in connection with the vexed question of patronage. The relations of Erskine and his followers to the "ruling party in the Church," however, had been already strained long before this: first, in the so-called Marrow Controversy (q.v.), in which they were rebuked by the General Assembly; and again in a celebrated case of alleged heresy—that of John Simson (q.v.), professor of divinity in the University of Glasgow, whose suspension from teaching without deprivation either of status or stipend was regarded by Erskine as a grossly inadequate sentence. In fact, in announcing their secession in the formal protest of Nov. 16, 1733, the four original members of the Associate Synod, as the new body was at first called, expressly ascribed the step which they felt it their duty to take, not to any one act of the Church, but to "a course of defection from our Reformed and covenanting principles."

Among the incidents of Erskine's later years mention should be made of his procedure in the rebellion of 1745. When the rebels occupied Stirling, he not only organized a Secession corps of volunteers in behalf of the government, but acted as their captain, and for his patriotic conduct received the thanks of the duke of Cumberland. It is also to his credit that when the Associate Synod was rent asunder in 1747 into "Burghers" and "Antiburghers" by disputes over religious clauses in oaths administered to burgesses of Scotch cities, he took the side of toleration, and while the Antiburghers excommunicated those who subscribed the required oath, he refused to make non-subscription a term of communion. On the other hand he showed a narrow spirit in reference to the work of George Whitefield and spoke contemptuously of the "noisy wind" which that "prelatic" preacher had "brought into the land." His published works were sermons and controversial pamphlets, which were issued in several collected editions after his death.

(William Lee†.) Henry Cowan.

Bibliography: A *Memoir*, by James Fisher, was prefixed to the *Works* of Ralph Erskine, Glasgow, 1764–66; an enlarged *Memoir*, by D. Fraser, was prefixed to the *Works* of Ebenezer Erskine, London, 1826, while the *Life and Diary* was issued separately, ib. 1831. Consult Hew Scott, *Fasti ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*, 5 parts, London, 1871; *DNB*, xvii. 404–407; J. Ker, *The Erskines, Ebenezer and Ralph*, Edinburgh, 1881.

ERSKINE, JOHN: Church of Scotland; b. at Edinburgh 1720 or 1721; d. there Jan. 19, 1803. His father was a distinguished member of the Scottish bar, and, deferring to his parents' wishes, John Erskine at first applied himself to the study of his father's profession. But a strong predilection for the Church had been early formed and showed itself, even while he was still a student in Edinburgh, in the publication of a theological work which gained him the friendship and correspondence of Bishop Warburton. He became a licentiate of the Church in 1743; and in 1744 he was ordained minister of the parish of Kirkintilloch, near Glasgow. In this laborious country charge Dr. Erskine, from the first, devoted himself earnestly and faithfully to his professional duties. And here, also, he formed those habits of careful preparation for the pulpit which never failed to render his sermons (which are vigorous expositions of Calvinism), if not eloquent, interesting and useful.

At this period of his life he began to maintain friendly intercourse on religious questions with representatives of foreign churches. In an age of bigotry and intolerance—at least among the members of the party to which he himself belonged—Dr. Erskine was, if no Broad-churchman in the modern acceptation of the term, a man of wide sympathies and enlightened Christian liberality. In the list of his earliest correspondents were several distinguished ministers of America, among them Jonathan Edwards. The strained relations between Britain and her American colonies distressed him deeply, and he published several pamphlets urging mutual concessions to prevent the war which eventually broke out. Reference has already been made to his friendly relations with Bishop Warburton, and he also corresponded with Bishop Hurd. He was no less friendly with some of the English dissenters, especially Whitefield (who preached in his pulpit at Kirkintilloch) and the Wesleys. His correspondence with members of the Continental Churches was long carried on with difficulty owing to his ignorance of any foreign language except French; but at the age of sixty he gained a competent knowledge of Dutch and German. He advocated and strenuously defended missions to the heathen at a time when both Churchmen and dissenters—in Scotland at any rate—were equally indifferent to what is now regarded as one of the chief obligations of the Christian Church.

In 1753 Dr. Erskine was translated from Kirkintilloch to the parish of Culross, and thence he removed, in 1758, to New Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh; after nine years, he went to the Collegiate Church of Old Greyfriars in the same city. Here he had Principal Robertson, the historian of Charles V., as his colleague and, in spite of their differences in ecclesiastical politics, as one of his best friends. As an Edinburgh minister, he was called to take a more prominent place in public business than before. As a leader in the church courts, he represented for many years the Evangelical or popular party in the Church. In this position, as in every other, he was far from adopting extreme views; and he enjoyed the respect and esteem of all parties throughout the whole of his long and useful life. His contributions to literature (twenty-five publications in all) include a volume of *Theological Dissertations* (London, 1765); *Considerations on the Spirit of Popery* (1778); and two volumes of *Discourses* (1798, 1804). He edited and republished various works of Jonathan Edwards and other Americans.

(William Lee†.) Henry Cowan.

Bibliography: H. M. Wellwood, *An Account of the Life and Writings of John Erskine*, Edinburgh, 1818; Hugh Miller, *Two Parties in the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1841; W and R. Chambers, *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen*, ii. 262–264, Glasgow, 1855; T. McCrie, *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, Edinburgh, 1875; W. Scott, *Guy Mannering*, chap. xxxvii.; *DNB*, xvii. 432–433.

ERSKINE, THOMAS: Scotch layman, known as "Thomas Erskine of Linlathen"; b. in Edinburgh Oct. 13, 1788; d. there Mar. 20, 1870. He was a nephew of John Erskine (q.v.), was educated in Edinburgh, and practised law from 1810 to 1816; then succeeding to the family estate at Linlathen, near Dundee, he retired from the bar and spent the rest of his life in the care of his property and theological writing. While still a young man, he rebelled at the current Scotch theology, and at length found what he conceived was a better way in which to represent the divine revelation. His views are thus summarized in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:

> The only proper criterion of the truth of Christianity is "its conformity or non-conformity with man's spiritual nature, and its adaptability or non-adaptability to man's universal and deepest spiritual needs." The incarnation of Christ was "the necessary manifestation to man of an eternal sonship in the divine nature, apart from which those filial qualities which God demands from man could have no sanction." Faith as used in the Bible is a "certain moral or spiritual condition which virtually implied salvation, because it implied the existence of a principle of spiritual life possessed of an immortal power. This faith could be properly awakened only by the manifestation, through Christ, of love as the law of life, and as identical with an eternal righteousness which it was God's purpose to bestow on every individual soul."

Such views were not "orthodox," and at first subjected Mr. Erskine to considerable adverse criticism. But they gained favor; and he numbered among his intimate friends and correspondents some of the finest minds of the century,—Thomas Carlyle, Edward Irving, Frederick Denison Maurice, John McLeod Campbell, Bishop Ewing, Norman Macleod, Dean Stanley, Adolphe Monod, and Alexandre Vinet. Maurice and Campbell were indebted to him for those conceptions of the Atonement which have had so great an effect upon later popular religious thought; and it was Campbell's public advocacy of them which led to his expulsion from the Kirk. Mr. Erskine's theology permeated his being, and it was his delight to impress his views upon all whom he met. His sincerity, earnestness,

sympathy, and pure and lofty character gave him a great influence. D. J. Vaughan (*Contemporary Review*, June, 1878) includes him among four Scotchmen whose influence on English thought has been wide, deep, and lasting. Monod traced to a talk with him his deliverance from Socinianism. Vinet wrote: "Were it allowable to say 'I am of Paul' and 'I of Apollos,' I should say 'I am of Erskine.'"

His more important writings were: *Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion* (Edinburgh, 1820; 10th ed., 1878); *An Essay on Faith* (1822); *The Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel* (1828; new ed., 1879); *The Brazen Serpent, or, Life Coming through Death* (1831; 3d ed., 1879); *The Doctrine of Election* (London, 1837; 2d ed., Edinburgh, 1878). *Spiritual Order and Other Papers* (Edinburgh, 1871) appeared posthumously, and in 1877 two volumes of *Letters*, ed. William Hanna, with reminiscences by Dean Stanley and Principal Shairp.

(William Lee†.) Henry Cowan.

Bibliography: *Letters of Thomas Erskine 1800–1840*, ed. W. Hanna, with a sketch of his ancestry, earlier years, etc., Edinburgh, 1877; *DNB*, xvii. 444–445.

ERTHAL, ār''tāl', FRANZ LUDWIG VON: Bishop of Würzburg and Bamberg; b. at Lohr-on-the-Main (26 m. e.s.e. of Frankfort) Sept. 16, 1730; d. at Würzburg Feb. 16, 1795. He belonged to an old Frankish noble family and was early destined for the Church. He studied theology and law at Würzburg and Mainz, and enlarged his legal knowledge in the papal chancery and at Vienna. In 1779 he was made bishop of Würzburg, and a few weeks later bishop of Bamberg. The traditional Würzburg policy, confessional considerations, and fear of the dangerous Prussians induced him to join the ranks of the imperial party. His relations to the Vatican were proper, but he was bent on maintaining his own sovereignty against both emperor and curia. A child of the time, he ruled in accordance with the maxim of enlightened despotism, "everything for the people, but everything through the ruler"; yet he was no tyrant, but governed as a benevolent patriarch, watching over all things, arranging all things, the head of the family, living only for his children. It was with the greatest reluctance that he ever imposed the death penalty. Under his mild rule the prisons were emptied, the finances and the entire civil service were regulated, and the poor laws were made to accord with the modern principle that only the disabled are to be helped and begging must cease. Lotteries were abolished and schools—primary, intermediate, and high—were fostered with zeal and knowledge. His natural inclination toward the practical and useful is apparent in the administration of his episcopal office and animates his pastoral letters and still more his "sermons for the people." These sermons seldom treat of doctrine or contain cold philosophical discussions, but speak with seriousness and emphasis of Christian living in a language somewhat uncouth and heavy, but of heart-winning simplicity. While they are not free from allusions to the gracious effects of the mystery of the altar or of the mass, on the whole they are truly Evangelical, not decked out with emotional legendary stories, and without confessional polemics. He visited his bishoprics, which constituted a kind of theocracy, as a simple priest, preaching in the most modest village church, examining the clergy vigorously and with justice, and admitting to it only the most worthy pupils of his seminary. The active, ascetic, feeble man wished for no pleasures, and stood alone on the height of his ruling office, which brought him only duties and cares. In vain will one seek among the German Roman Catholic ecclesiastical princes a more noble personality, a more worthy priest and a more earnest Christian.

D. Kerler†.

Bibliography: F. Leitschuh, *Franz Ludwig von Erthal*, Bamberg, 1894; *Zum Gedächtnis des Fürstbischofs Franz Ludwig von Erthal*, in *Archiv des historischen Vereins von Unterfranken und Aschaffenburg*, vol. xxxvii., Würzburg, 1895.

ESARHADDON. See Assyria, VI. 3, § 13.

ESAU. See Edom; Jacob.

ESCHATOLOGY.

Primitive Views (§ 1).
Old Testament Doctrine (§ 2).
New Testament Teaching (§ 3).
Significance of Eschatology (§ 4).
The Second Coming (§ 5).
The Resurrection (§ 6).
The Judgment (§ 7).

Eschatology (Gk. *ta eschata*) is the doctrine of the last things. In theology this signifies those events occurring after death which immediately concern man. Without detailed treatment the purpose here is to sketch only the principal lines of the subject.

1. Primitive Views.

Belief in some sort of existence after death appears to be a universal characteristic of the human race, though neither the earliest form nor the precise cause of this belief among prehistoric peoples is known. It may have originated in dreams, or have expressed itself in animism, or have been a prolongation of the instinct of self-preservation (see Comparative Religion, VI., 1, § 2). From 4000 B.C. the daily life of the Egyptians was saturated with this expectation (cf. the "Book of the Dead"). That the belief was widespread from 1500 to 1000 B.C. is evinced in the great literary religious documents which have come down to us. The Homeric Hades is a gloomy underworld to which all the dead go, there to exist as wretched shades beyond the reach of divine help. The Babylonians knew of "a land of no return" ("Lay of Istar's Descent to Hades," see Babylonia, VII., 3, § 5). The later Zoroastrian literature pictures the destinies of the dead with terrible severity (see Zoroaster, Zoroastrianism). Plato (d. 347 B.C.) elaborated his splendid argument for immortality ("Phædo")—a hope repudiated by the Epicureans, and only in part reaffirmed by the Stoic doctrine of a limited survival after death (see Immortality).

2. Old Testament Doctrine.

According to the Old Testament all the dead go to Sheol (see Hades). Thus in some sort immortality was affirmed; but this belief did not until the fourth century B.C. emphasize individual immortality, in the sense of personal moral development. This appears the more strange when one considers the profound belief of the Hebrews in Yahweh, who alone had power to make alive

(Deut. xxxii. 29; I Sam. ii. 6). This hope centered in national rather than in individual blessedness, which is to be explained by the fact that their evolution had not proceeded far enough for them to draw the consequences of separating the individual from the collective unit of the nation (cf. Ezek. xxxiii.). The Messianic kingdom was to be ushered in by the Day of Yahweh (see DAY OF THE LORD)—a day of judgment directed against all evil-doers. This kingdom was destined primarily for the righteous who might then be living on the earth; the relation of the Gentiles to this kingdom was variously conceived (Hos. vi. 2; Isa. xxv 8; Ezek. xxxvii.). For the pious Hebrews who had died, participation in it was possible only through resurrection, which is clearly presented in two passages (Isa. xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2). In the first, communion with God is uninterrupted between death and the advent of the Messianic kingdom; in the second, resurrection of the rightcous and the wicked is by an omnipotent act of God. In the Old Testament, however, one looks in vain for anything like a completed doctrine of resurrection (cf. the frequent laments of the Psalms concerning death). The entire eschatological hope reflects the progressive stages of culture attained by the Hebrews, as affected by their developing ethical consciousness and by the spiritual disclosure of God in their history. Growing out of this advancing idea of God as absolute Creator and Lord of all, to whom at length no region of life or of the unseen was closed, was the notion of the worth of those to whom he had given life: they must ultimately share in his blessedness. The strength of this hope, embodied in a crass supernaturalism indeed, was disclosed in the many apocalypses which sprang up from 200 B.C. to 100 A.D. A special development of this hope arose among the Pharisees as they looked forward to a restoration of the theocracy (II Macc.), or as they were influenced by Greek philosophy (Wisdom).

3. New Testament Teaching.

The synoptic teaching deals with the Messianic kingdom. For Jesus the central point of interest certainly lay in this kingdom as essentially supernatural and essentially future. Just what was the precise relation between these two aspects in his own consciousness is hard to ascertain. He at any rate never surrendered himself to the enthusiastic extravagances of contemporary apocalyptic hope; he laid sovereign stress on the ethical and spiritual principles of his kingdom. His teaching concerning the kingdom centers in the parusia, the resurrection, and the judgment. In the parusia, in which naturally his own resurrection is presupposed, his advent was to be sudden and unexpected, although no one knew the exact hour, not even the Son, but the Father alone. At one time he appears to look for his return shortly, again only after long delay. Then follows the resurrection through which the righteous enter the Messianic kingdom. The resurrection of the wicked is given as a part of the teaching of Jesus, but in only two passages (Luke xx. 27–40; John v 28, 29). The judgment is pictured now according to the program of the Day of Yahweh (see DAY OF THE LORD) in the Old Testament (see JUDGMENT, DIVINE), now as present and continuous; the principle of it is the light one has received, and one's humane or inhumane treatment of others in whom Christ is immanent. Eternal felicity and communion with God are assured to his followers in the future kingdom. Paul's doctrine of the future, which bears many traces of his former Pharisaic beliefs, with reminders of the Book of Daniel (chap. vii.), centers in the second advent of Christ (I Thess. iv. 13–18; II Thess. i. 7, 8). The Lord, accompanied by angels in flaming power, shall make a glorious and terrible descent from heaven, when the dead in Christ shall rise first, the living be transformed, and all together be rapt into the air to meet the Lord, ever thereafter to be with him. The other New Testament writers share the apostle's expectation of the impending advent. Later Paul appears to have experienced a change of view both as to its outer and inner character and as to the time of its occurrence. Before the advent, however, the apostle anticipated three events. (1) The culmination of the power of evil which should be disclosed and overthrown. This included an apostasy, the unveiling of the "man of sin," "the son of perdition," the "lawless one" (II Thess. ii. 3, 4, 8; cf. Satan or Beliar, II Cor. vi. 15, and Antichrist, I John ii. 18, 22), and the removal of that which now hindered the full development of the godless one—either Elijah or the existing Roman authority. (2) The Gentiles and finally the Jews are to be converted (Rom. xi. 13–27). (3) Believers must suffer violent persecution. With the advent occurs the resurrection of believers, of which the resurrection of Christ was the pledge; all will then be raised, or if only believers, then later perhaps the wicked also (cf. I Cor. xv. 23, 24). The Revelation decides for a double resurrection (chap. xx. 4–6). Concerning the condition of the dead before the resurrection, we discern an earlier and a later view: according to the first, believers were to be after death as if asleep; according to the second, death ushered them at once into a fuller communion with their glorified Lord. When Christ comes, his followers shall stand before his judgment seat, the wicked be destroyed, external nature already redeemed shall be glorified, and he who was the Redeemer surrender his Lordship to the Father, that God may be all things in all men (II Cor. v 10; II Thess. ii. 7–10; Rom. viii. 19–22; I Cor. xv. 24–28).

4. Significance of Eschatology.

Eschatological hopes have profoundly affected the Christian Church in nearly all periods of her history. As Schleiermacher pointed out, these hopes are a witness to the principle of teleology implanted in the nature of man; the influence of this has been to bind men to an ultimately spiritual interpretation of human life and of the world as subordinate to it. Immanent in the Christian hope itself is the indestructible pledge of its complete realization. The Scriptures had emphasized one point of greatest significance: the essential unity of the possession and the fulfilment of redemption. So far as the ethical content of redemption was progressively apprehended, the

necessity that it be ethically (historically) rather than apocalyptically (magically) realized compelled a new point of view for the whole subject. And if now one still uses the apocalyptic phraseology of the Scriptures, it will be permitted only when one has replaced its external cosmological reference with an ethical and spiritual content. In no case may form and content be identified. That this principle has been violated, the history of the belief will show. In Christian belief, the chief eschatological events are: the second coming, the resurrection, and the final judgment.

5. The Second Coming.

The second coming has been conceived of under two general forms: either a visible, glorious appearing of Christ at a moment fixed in the divine purpose, or a silent, gradual penetration of all social forces by his spirit, to be either perpetual or continued until the consummation. There will thus be such a disclosure of Christ as will render the divinity of his kingdom unmistakable; this will meet with either a completely sympathetic or partly hostile reception. Preceding or associated with the advent have been several distinctive features. (1) The millennium (see MILLENNIUM, MILLENARIANISM). The Chiliastic hopes of the early Christians, based on Rev. xx. 4–6, colored by Jewish apocalyptic fancies, are rejected by the Alexandrian Fathers. The millennium was ascribed by Augustine to the church militant. At the Reformation the earlier fancies were revived by the Anabaptists, receiving a vehement condemnation in the Augsburg Confession (Art. xvii.). Of the dogmatists who held that the second coming, general resurrection, last judgment, and end of the world would occur at the same time, some placed the 1,000 years and the binding of Satan at about 300–1300 A.D. More recently Bengel has had many followers in a refined form of the millennial idea. The pre- and post-millennialists are distinguished according as the advent is placed before or after the 1,000 years. (2) The "Antichrist" has received many interpretations, having been identified in the early church with Nero, among the Reformers with the Papacy, later with successive forces of evil as opposed to God, again with systems of belief or with a social order subversive of the Church, or finally with an embodied evil principle in conflict with the Gospel. Here is without doubt an echo of the Babylonian creation-story of the conflict of Light with Tiamat or chaos, the later Jewish thought of Satan (q.v.), and the fierce struggle of the Jewish religious people under Judas Maccabeus against Antiochus Epiphanes (see HASMONEANS). (3) The intermediate state. The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church concerning this includes the doctrine of Purgatory and the Limbus of the Fathers. Purgatory is for those who departing this life in faith are liable to punitive sufferings for venial sins or for the vestiges of mortal sins and who must, before their entrance into heaven, be purified—to be the sooner effected by the suffrages (prayers and good works) of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar (Council of Trent, sess. xxv.). This is not to be confused with a continued or a second probation. The Limbus of the Fathers was the abode of the Old Testament saints to whom Christ after his death and before his ascension appeared for their liberation when he took them with himself in his ascent to heaven (Ps. xvi. 10; I Pet. iii. 19; see DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HELL). This doctrine rests upon the Jewish notion of the dead as in a condition of privation awaiting the appearance of the Messiah to raise their bodies from the ground and call their disembodied spirits from the shades of the under-world, thus through union of soul and body introducing the risen Israel to a more than earthly prosperity and blessedness. In the Protestant Church the doctrine of an intermediate state has been either rejected or variously conceived. The earlier Protestant writers held that the righteous and the wicked went at once to a place of happiness or misery—the souls of believers being made perfect in holiness (cf. the Shorter Catechism, Ques. 37; also W G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, ii. 353, iii. 453, New York, 1889); on the other hand, those who die in their sins were thought of as entering a region where they should behold in God their "perfect and irreconcilable enemy" (cf. J. Edwards, *Works*, vi. 123, New York, 1830). In their respective conditions both classes remain until the second coming, all waiting for the "Great Assize," at which the earthly deeds of the wicked and possibly of the good shall be made manifest and judged. Associated with the intermediate state have been several doctrines. (a) The sleep of souls (psychopannychy; cf. I Thess. iv. 13–15; I Cor. xv. 6, 18, 20, 51; Acts vii. 60, xiii. 36). Between death and the second coming the condition of the soul will be that of a dreamless sleep (cf. R. Whately, *Concerning a Future State*, London, 1829). (b) A nucleus of the personality of the unsaved is preserved during the middle state until the judgment, when by a creative act God will reunite soul and body, after which they will be gradually annihilated (cf. Edward White, *Life in Christ*, London, 1875; see ANNIHILATIONISM). (c) The soul being bodiless during the intermediate state is in a condition of "involution," "progressive development" (Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, Edinburgh, 1865), "deepest retirement" (Van Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, 2 parts, New York, 1872), "spiritual seclusion" (I. A. Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1880 sqq). (d) In the intermediate state, to those who have not in this life definitely rejected Christ—the heathen and others to whom knowledge of Christ was impossible—a probation will be open. This is based on the absolute universality of the Gospel, the indispensableness of faith in Christ as historically revealed for salvation, an unvarying unity of the moral order; finally, if universal salvation is to be affirmed, the offer of grace must be effectually continued in another world (see PROBATION, FUTURE; and UNIVERSALISTS).

According to Schleiermacher, since Christianity is a historical religion and its progress is historically conditioned, those who die without having been reached by the divine call, will, in a future existence, become subjects of a divine influence which will create for them the possibility of entering the society of the redeemed.

6. The Resurrection.

Most of the early Christians held to a resurrection of the same bodies that died—"the flesh," "this flesh"—in every respect identical with the earthly body. Origen sought to give the doctrine an idealistic interpretation; others would relieve it of its grosser features; while the Gnostics, following the Greek conception of matter in relation to spirit, denied the physical resurrection. The early Protestant view was that the same body laid down at death shall be raised, with the same form as the earthly body and reunited to the soul, so as to be glorious, powerful, spiritual, celestial—the same body but of different quality. Two other conceptions of the resurrection have been suggested. One, that this occurs for each one at death when he enters at once into another sphere of life; the other, that it is a resurrection from the dead, that it therefore stands for the ethical completion of life in union with Christ, uninterrupted by death, and after death carried to perfection. (See HEAVEN.)

7. The Judgment.

In the early Church judgment was presented in many forms. The Son or the Father was the judge. Some souls—those, e.g., of martyrs—went at once to the felicity of heaven (Tertullian and Gregory Nazianzen); the Gnostics affirmed this only of the most spiritual persons. The judgment was to be accompanied by alarming physical signs together with a conflagration, in which the world shall be destroyed. The punishment of hell was depicted in bold and sensuous imagery—some regarding the fire as material (Lactantius, *De Spectaculis*). Others conceived of punishment as a sense of separation from God. Restorationism was advocated by Origen, but was overcome until long afterward, the opposite view being general—the eternal duration of punishment. By the scholastics heaven was divided into the firmament of the visible heaven, the spiritual heaven as the abode of saints and angels, and the intellectual heaven as the sphere of the beatific vision. Hell was also partitioned off: the place of devils and the damned; and the various subterranean regions, as Purgatory, Limbus Infantum, and Limbus Patrum. Here and there a voice was heard in favor of Origen's view, but the prevailing doctrine was that of unrelieved eternity of penalty for those dying in mortal sin (cf. Dante's inscription over the gate of hell, "Leave all hope, all who enter," *Inferno*, canto iii., v. 9). Origen's conception woke to life again in John Scotus Erigena. In the sixteenth century the question suggested by some of the Fathers (Justin, Tatian), whether the soul was naturally mortal or immortal, was once more raised in connection with the doctrine of punishment. Protestant writers, especially those of mystical temperament, pictured the joys of heaven and the pains of the lost with elaborate and either glowing or harrowing particulars of time and place and inner experience, addressed to the feverish imagination and appealing to hope or fear. In more recent times the entire question of eschatology has entered upon a further development. In addition to the doctrine of the endless punishment of those who die impenitent, there are offered two other solutions of this problem which take their rise in the Scriptures, having already appeared in both ancient and modern thought—universal restoration (see UNIVERSALISTS) and conditional immortality (see ANNIHILATIONISM). The theory of evolution has set all former questions in a new light and demanded a reconsideration of them in the light of its principle. In addition to this, the doctrine of universal restoration grounds its hope on the absoluteness of God, the indefeasible continuity of grace, and the indestructible confidence that finally the better self in every man will yield to the divine persuasion and God will succeed in his eternal purpose of redemption. Conditional immortality argues either from an annihilating fiat of God at the judgment or from the well-known biological law that function determines organism. Since already many living forms which once flourished on the earth, having gradually ceased to adapt themselves to their environment, have perished, the same fate will overtake all souls who refuse response to the ethical and spiritual environment of life. Thus man is "immortable" (S. D. McConnell, *Evolution of Immortality*, New York, 1901).

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The titles of the older literature, covering the non-Christian religions, are collected in E. Abbot's *Literature of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (appended to W. R. Alger, *Destiny of the Soul; Critical Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, Boston, many editions, e.g., 1880, reprinted separately), New York, 1871. The reader should consult the literature under the articles mentioned in the text—e.g., ANNIHILATIONISM; FUTURE PUNISHMENT; HADES; IMMORTALITY; JUDGMENT; MILLENNIUM, MILLENARIANISM; PROBATION, FUTURE. The literature on the eschatology of non-Christian religions should be sought under the articles on those faiths and under COMPARATIVE RELIGION. The most important literature on the Christian doctrine is mentioned in the text. Consult further: F. Richter, *Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, 2 vols., Breslau, 1843–44; S. Lee, *Eschatology*, Boston, 1858; W Flörke, *Die letzten Dinge*, Rostock, 1866; S. Davidson, *Doctrine of Last Things Contained in the N. T.*, London, 1882 (affirms that no consistent doctrine is taught in the N. T.); sections 151–154 of Dorner's "System of Christian Doctrine" is translated by N. Smyth in *Dorner on the Future State*, New York, 1883; H. Karsten, *Die Letzten Dinge*, Hamburg, 1885; C. E. Luthardt, *Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, Leipsic, 1885; F. Kliefoth, *Christliche Eschatologie*, 1887; J. A. Spencer, *Five Last Things*, New York, 1887; J. M. Greene, *The Blessed Dead*, Boston, 1888; J. Fyfe, *The Hereafter*, Edinburgh, 1890; F. G. Hibbard, *Eschatology*, New York, 1890 (deals with the doctrine as set forth in the Book of Revelation); H. M. Luckock, *After Death*, London, 1890; J. Strong, *The Doctrine of a Future Life*, New York, 1891; J. Cross, *Coming Eschatological Events as Revealed in Holy Writ*, London, 1893; K. Rohr, *Die letzten Dinge*, Basel, 1895; G. S. Barrett, *The Intermediate State and the Last Things*, London, 1896; S. D. F. Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Edinburgh, 1896; J. T. Beck, *Die Vollendung des Reiches Gottes*, Gütersloh, 1897; R. H. Charles, *Critical Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, London, 1899 (for Jewish and early Christian eschatology); W. B. Brown, *Problem of Final Destiny*, New York, 1900; M. v. Cochem, *The Four Last Things*, ib. 1900; J. Fiske, *Life Everlasting*, Boston, 1901; G. Delanne, *Evidences for a Future Life*, New York, 1904; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, ib. 1904; C. A. Beckwith, *Realities of Christian Theology*, Boston, 1906; L. Elbe, *Future Life in the Light of Ancient and Modern Science*, Chicago, 1906; G. T. Fechner, *On Life after Death*, ib. 1906; L. A. Muirhead, *The Eschatology of Jesus*, London, 1906; S. Baring-Gould, *The Restitution of All Things*, New York, 1907. Besides these works, the reader may consult also the various treatises on systematic theology, more or less space being always devoted to the subject; the works on the history of doctrine will guide to the historical study of the topic.

ESCOBAR, MARINA DE: Spanish mystic; b. at Valladolid 1554; d. there July 9, 1633. She was a near relative of Antonio Escobar y Mendoza (q.v.), and a pupil and penitent of the Jesuit Ludovico da Ponte, who trained her in the spirit of his order. She attained renown by her extraordinary promotion of prayer of the heart, by her wonderful visions, and as a reformer of the Spanish branch of the Brigittines (see BRIDGET, SAINT, OF SWEDEN AND THE BRIGITTINE ORDER). Many Roman Catholic writers term her "Blessed" and "Honorable," while Alban Stolz even calls her "Saint."

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The original *Vita* was by F. Cachupin, 2 vols., Madrid, 1664–73, Lat. transl. by M. Hanel, Prague, 1672–88. Cf. *KL*, iv. 890–891.

ESCOBAR Y MENDOZA, ANTONIO: Spanish Jesuit; b. at Valladolid 1589; d. there July 4, 1669. He was a scion of a distinguished family of intense piety, and was noteworthy for his asceticism and his energy as a preacher and priest. His literary productivity was enormous, his works filling eighty-three volumes. He began his literary career with the epics *San Ignacio de Loyola* (Valladolid, 1613) and *Historia de la Virgen Madre de Dios* (1618), but the remainder of his writings are devoted either to exegesis or to moral theology. To the former category belong, among others, *In Evangelia Sanctorum commentarii* (6 vols., Lyons, 1642–1648); *In Evangelia temporis commentarii* (6 vols., 1647–48); *Vetus ac Novum Testamentum litteralibus et moralibus commentariis illustratum* (8 vols., 1652–1667); and a number of commentaries on individual books of the Bible, among which special mention may be made of his *In Cantica commentarii, sive de Mariæ Deiparæ elogiis* (Lyons, 1669). The fame of Escobar is chiefly based, however, on his works on moral theology, of which the *Summula casuum conscientiæ* (Pampeluna, 1627) is the shortest, the *Universæ theologiæ moralis receptiores absque lite sententiæ* (7 vols., Lyons, 1652–66) the longest, and the *Liber theologiæ moralis viginti-quattuor Societatis Jesu doctoribus reseratus* (1664) the best known. The last-named work summarizes the contributions of Escobar's chief predecessors to probabilistic casuistry. A certain apparent laxity in ethics exposed the author to many attacks, particularly from Pascal in his *Lettres provinciales*, while the Roman Catholic world gradually formed an unfavorable judgment of the work. The parliaments of Paris, Rennes, and Rouen condemned the book to be burned, and modern Jesuits disavow the work more or less completely.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus*, ii. 172–176, Brussels, 1853; J. Huber, *Der Jesuitenorden*, pp. 282–315, Berlin, 1873; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, ii. 229–231, Innsbruck, 1893; *KL*, iv. 892.

ESDRAELON. See JEZREEL.

ESDRAS: Books of Old Testament Apocrypha. For I (or III) Esdras, see APOCRYPHA, A, IV., 1; for II (or IV) Esdras, see PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, II., 7; for the pseudepigraphic V and VI Esdras, see PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, II., 8.

ESKIL: Archbishop of Lund; b. about 1102; d. at Clairvaux Sept. 6, 1181 (or 1182). He studied at the cathedral school of Hildesheim, was appointed canon, and later head keeper, at the cathedral in Lund, and in 1134 bishop of Roskilde. There he allied himself with Peder Bodilsen, a powerful lord, and succeeded in forcing King Erik Emune to flee Zealand. The king mustered fresh troops in Jutland, invaded Zealand, and forced the allies to surrender. Eskil escaped with a fine, but when, in 1137, he was elected archbishop of Lund by popular vote, the king refused to sanction his appointment, and the archbishopric remained vacant until the king's death (Sept. 18, 1137), when Eskil was finally invested with the dignity. As archbishop he took prominent part in the strife for the throne, and on one occasion was compelled to flee after breaking his oath of allegiance to one of the contestants. In 1139 he convened at Lund a provincial synod which was attended by bishops from Sweden, Norway, and the Faroe Islands; and during the following years he founded a Cistercian monastery at Herisvad, Sweden (1143), and a Benedictine cloister at Esrom (1144). After having taken part in a crusade against the Wends he visited his friend Bernard at Clairvaux (1152). Upon his return he was met by Cardinal Nicholas Breakspear (afterward Pope Adrian IV.), who had brought the pallium for an archbishop of Sweden, but as no archiepiscopal seat could be agreed upon the pallium was left with Eskil. He held it until 1164, when he transferred it to the first archbishop of Upsala. According to the pope's decision the archbishops of Lund were to retain the primacy of Sweden. In 1154, after the death of Bernard, Eskil again traveled to Clairvaux, later visiting Rome. On his way home he was imprisoned by some German knights, and as Emperor Frederick I. refused to intervene a rupture resulted between the emperor and the papal delegates. Eskil reached Denmark in time for the coronation of Waldemar I (1157). He took part in another crusade against the Wends, but in 1159 lost favor with the king, was forced to flee Denmark, and spent seven years at Clairvaux, at length receiving the king's permission to return to his archbishopric. In 1174 the pope refused him permission to retire to a monastery, but in 1177 he renewed his petition with success, and spent his last days at Clairvaux.

(F. NIELSEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: Saxo Grammaticus, *Hist. Danica*, book xiii., ed. G. Waitz in *MGH, Script.* xxix, (1892), 43–161; J. Langebek, *Script. rer. Danicarum*, consult the Index, ix. 194–195, Copenhagen, 1772–1878. Consult: H. Reuter, *Geschichte Alexander des Dritten*, Leipsic, 1860–64; C. F. W. I. Karup, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Dänemark*, Münster, 1863; *KL*, iv. 902–904.

ESKIMOS, MISSIONS TO THE. See EGEDE, HANS.

ESPEN, ZEGER BERNHARD VAN: One of the canonists who endeavored to carry out the principles of the episcopal system of the Roman Catholic Church as developed in France and exercised a great influence on the doctrine and practise developed from that system in the Netherlands and Germany; b. at Louvain July 9, 1646; d. at Amers-

foort (12 m. e.n.e. of Utrecht) Oct. 2, 1728. He studied theology and canon law at Louvain, was made a priest in 1673, doctor of law in 1675 and professor of canon law in his native city. His lectures and elegantly written works soon made him famous, and from all sides his decisions on canon law were demanded. His main work, *Jus ecclesiasticum universum* (Louvain, 1700; Cologne, 1702), is still a treasure for the canonists, although it was put on the Index in 1704 because he defended the Jansenists. E. SEHLING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Du Pac de Bellegarde, *Vie de van Espen*, Louvain, 1767; F. Laurent, *Van Espen*, 3 parts, Brussels, 1860–63; *KL*, iv. 904–905.

ESS, KARL AND LEANDER VAN: Two Roman Catholic Bible translators.

1. Karl van Ess was born at Warburg (18 m. s.e. of Paderborn) Sept. 25, 1770; d. at Huysburg (30 m. s.w. of Magdeburg) Oct. 22, 1824. His education was begun in the gymnasium of the Dominicans at Warburg, whence he went to the abbey at Huysburg in 1788; he was made priest in 1794, and became prior of his abbey in 1801. When the abbey was closed in 1804, he became priest of the town of Huysburg and acted as vicar-general for Magdeburg, Halberstadt, and Helmstedt. He was an orthodox Catholic, but at first was so liberal in tendency that he included a number of Protestant hymns in the Osnabrück Hymnal. After the fall of Napoleon and the rise of Prussia he became pronouncedly ultramontane and, in a short "History of Religion" published in 1817 on the occasion of the celebration of the Reformation, criticized sharply the Evangelical churches. His literary activity includes his part in the translation of the New Testament with his cousin Leander, *Kurze Geschichte der Abtei Huysburg* (Halberstadt, 1810), *Katechismus* (1822), and the *Kurze Geschichte der Religion* referred to above. E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. C. Felder von Borromæo, *Gelehrten und Schriftsteller-Lexikon*, i. 202, Landshut, 1817; *ADB*, vi. 377; *KL*, iv. 908.

2. Johann Heinrich, better known by his Benedictine name **Leander van Ess,** was born at Warburg Feb. 15, 1772; d. at Affolderbach (20 m. n.e. of Heidelberg) Oct. 13, 1847. He was educated by the Dominicans at Warburg; entered the Benedictine abbey Marienmünster near Paderborn, 1790; was made priest and pastor at Schwalenberg, 1796. He became preacher for the Catholic Church at Marburg and professor in the university there in 1812; and retired in 1822. He was deeply interested in the dissemination of the Bible, and wrote many pamphlets in which he advocated more frequent use of the Scriptures by the laity. With his cousin Karl he published a German translation of the New Testament (Brunswick, 1807); alone he published the Old Testament in German (part 1, Sulzbach, 1822, part 2, 1836), and with his pupil Wetzer the whole Bible in three parts (1840). In 1821 he prefixed a preface to a work on mixed marriages by a Roman Catholic priest and it was put on the Index Dec. 17, 1821, and two days later the same was done with his translation of the New Testament, though the latter received the commendation of the Roman Catholic faculty at Tübingen and of the vicar-general of Bruchsal. His edition of the Vulgate was published in three parts (1822–1824); and of the Septuagint in 1824 (latest ed. by E. Nestle, with Prolegomena and Epilegomena, 1887); in his New Testament he combined the Complutensian and Erasmian readings. In the copies circulated by the BFBS, the prefaces have been removed. Other writings are: *Pragmatica doctorum catholicorum Tridentini circa Vulgatam decreti sensum historia* (Sulzbach, 1801); *Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata* (Tübingen, 1821); *Wesenlchren des christlichen Glaubens und Lebens* (1823).

E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. C. Felder von Borromæo, *Gelehrten und Schriftsteller-Lexikon*, i. 203–204, Landshut, 1817; H. E. Scriba, *Biographisch-literärisches Lexikon*, i. 94–97, Darmstadt, 1831; *ADB*, vi. 377 sqq.; *KL*, iv. 909–910.

ESSAYS AND REVIEWS: The title of a book projected and edited by Henry Bristow Wilson (q.v.) and published in London Mar. 24, 1860, which occasioned a remarkable theological controversy. It included seven essays by as many authors: *The Education of the World*, by Frederick Temple; *Bunsen's Biblical Researches*, by Rowland Williams; *On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity*, by Baden Powell; *Séances historiques de Genève*, *The National Church*, by Henry Bristow Wilson; *On the Mosaic Cosmogony*, by Charles Wycliffe Goodwin; *Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688–1750*, by Mark Pattison; and *On the Interpretation of Scripture*, by Benjamin Jowett.

With the exception of Goodwin all the writers were clergymen, and with the exception of Williams and Goodwin all were Oxford men. The book attracted little attention until the appearance of an anonymous review in the *Westminster Review* for Oct., 1860. Under the title *Neo-Christianity* the writer (Frederic Harrison) assumed a jubilant tone and welcomed the essayists to the ranks of liberalism (the review is reprinted in Harrison's *Creed of a Layman*, London, 1907). The clergy now took alarm. Samuel Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford, after warning his clergy against the book in his autumn charge, took up the controversy in the *Quarterly Review* for Jan., 1861. He accused the essayists of neology, rationalism, and skepticism, and denounced them for their dishonesty in holding such views and remaining in the Church. A petition of protest was presented to the archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Mar. 13, 1861, signed by 10,000 clergy. Meanwhile, on Feb. 16 there had appeared in the *Times* the so-called "Episcopal Manifesto," in the form of a letter from the archbishop of Canterbury in answer to one of the numerous remonstrances with which the bishops had been besieged; to it were affixed the names of twenty-five bishops, who joined the archbishop "in expressing the pain it has given them that any clergyman should have published such opinions." Both houses of convocation expressed condemnation of the book, and Williams and Wilson were summoned before the court of arches, which pronounced final decision in Dec., 1862. Williams was convicted of denying the inspiration of Holy Scripture and of holding heretical views on propitiation and justifi-

cation, Wilson of denying the inspiration of Holy Scripture and also of denying the eternity of future punishment, and both were sentenced to suspension for one year, with payment of costs. Appeals to the queen in council were heard June 19–26 before the judicial committee, which included Lord Chancellor Westbury, Lords Cranworth, Chelmsford, and Kingsdown, the two archbishops, and the bishop of London, each appellant pleading his case in person. Lord Westbury finally delivered his judgment Feb. 8, 1864. Restricting itself to the specific passages cited by the prosecution, the court decided that the opinions expressed therein were not inconsistent with the articles and formularies of the Church of England. Accordingly the judgment of the court of arches was reversed; and the appellants were granted the costs of the appeal. Some of the points affirmed by the judgment were, that it is not penal in a clergyman "to speak of merit by transfer as a fiction," or "to deny the proposition that every part of every book of Holy Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and is the Word of God," or to express the hope "that even the ultimate pardon of the wicked, who are condemned in the day of judgment, may be consistent with the will of Almighty God." The decision naturally put a stop to a prosecution that had been begun against Jowett in the vice-chancellor's court at Oxford Feb. 20, 1863.

The announcement of the judgment started the agitation afresh. On Feb. 24, 1864, at the instance of E. B. Pusey, the so-called "Oxford Declaration on Inspiration and Eternal Punishment" was prepared and sent to every clergyman of the Established Church in England, Wales, and Ireland, with a letter adjuring him to sign it without delay. It was addressed to the bishops and archbishops, and in the course of a few weeks was signed by 11,000 clergymen. The two archbishops dissented from the judgment of the privy council and each stated his position in a pastoral letter. On Mar. 16, a deputation waited on them at Lambeth Palace to present an address signed, it was said, by 137,000 laymen, who desired to thank the primates for the stand they had taken. The bishop of London (Tait), who had concurred in the judgment, was made the subject of many attacks. In June a resolution offered by Wilberforce was carried in the upper house of convocation by a vote of eight to two (the bishops of London and Lincoln) synodically condemning the book "as containing teaching contrary to the doctrine received by the United Church of England and Ireland in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ." After a stormy debate, in the course of which A. P Stanley and others urged strong arguments against the measure, the lower house concurred in this resolution June 24 by a vote of thirty-nine to nineteen. In July Lord Houghton brought this action of convocation before the House of Lords. Lord Chancellor Westbury pronounced it illegal, but not worth noticing. "The judgment," he said, "is simply a series of well-lubricated terms, a sentence so oily and saponaceous that no one could grasp it"; from this characterization originated Wilberforce's nickname of "Soapy Sam" (see WILBERFORCE, SAMUEL). The judgment of the judicial committee, as a matter of course, became a part of the law of England and was ultimately acquiesced in. With the judgment in the Gorham Case (q.v.) it has established the right of an English clergyman freely to express the opinions he honestly holds.

How little this charge of heresy affected their ecclesiastical preferment is shown by the positions three of them subsequently held: Temple became bishop of Exeter (1869), of London 1885, and then archbishop of Canterbury (1896); Pattison rector of Lincoln College, Oxford (1861), and Jowett, master of Balliol (1870).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature educed by the *Essays and Reviews* is enormous; a guide to it may be found in S. A. Allibone, *Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, iii. 2771–72, Philadelphia, 1891, and many titles are collected in the *British Museum Catalogue* under "Essays and Reviews." Consult: R. B. Kennard, *Essays and Reviews; their Origin, History, General Character, and Significance, Persecution, Prosecution; the Judgment of the Arches Court, Review of Judgment*, London, 1863 ("an exposition, a history, and a defense"); H. B. Wilson, *Speech before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council*, ib. 1863; and A. P. Stanley, in *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1861.

ESSENES, es-sînz': One of the three Jewish sects of the time of Christ. According to the testimony of Philo and Josephus, the Essenes, numbering about 4,000, lived in the time of Christ in Palestine, partly in their own colonies by the Dead Sea, in the wilderness of Engedi (Pliny, v. 17), partly in cities (Josephus, *War*, II. viii. 4). Excluded from the temple in Jerusalem, the Essenes formed a community resembling that of a monastic order, entrance into which involved a double novitiate. An applicant spent a year outside of the community, during which its mode of life was recommended to him. He was provided with a spade (symbol of work), an apron (to be used at the ablutions), and a white dress (the robe of the order). During his second novitiate of two years the candidate was admitted to the lustrations but not to the meals. At the end of that period he was admitted to the order. But before becoming a full member he had to bind himself by a solemn oath (the last permitted to him, since the Essenes rejected the use of the oath elsewhere), in which he promised to honor God, to exercise justice, to injure no one intentionally, to obey the superiors, and not to divulge any of the secrets of the order. Children were also received into the order to be educated for the community. The superiors of the order had an extended jurisdiction; without their command nothing could be done. A court consisting of 100 members judged offenses and could decree exclusion from the order.

The Novitiate.

The members had everything in common, and upon entering the order the candidate cast all his possessions into the common treasury. The principal but not the only industry was agriculture. The mode of life was very simple. Anointing the body with oil was considered defilement. Slavery was not tolerated, the strictest truthfulness was enjoined. Before the sun arose the members never discussed secular matters.

The Order, Practise and Doctrines.

According to Josephus they addressed their "ancient prayers to the sun, as if entreating him to rise." After prayers, work commenced, followed by a meal for which they prepared by ablutions. After the meal they returned to work and at evening reassembled to partake of the evening meal. They observed the Sabbath strictly, rejected bloody sacrifices, but sent their oblations to the temple. Of the religious tenets and teaching of the Essenes little is known. They were no doubt Jews. The law was highly esteemed, and was expounded on the Sabbath and punctiliously observed. In this respect the Essenes resembled the Pharisees. According to Josephus they occupied themselves only with the ethical side of philosophy. They believed in the immortality of the soul and in angels; not to divulge the names of the angels was a part of the oath taken by novices.

Essenism was an enigmatic phenomenon concerning which views differ. The name appears in different forms (*Essaioi* in Philo, *Essenoi* in Josephus, *Esseni* in Pliny), and has been variously interpreted. Some derive it from the Greek *hosios*, "pious"; others from the Semitic *hasse*, plural *hassin*, "pious,"; and others from *assaya*, "physicians"; Salmasius (according to Josephus, *Ant.* XIII., xv. 3) derived it from the city of Essa, a hypothesis adopted by Hilgenfeld.

Theories of Its Origin and Character. As difficult as the explanation of the name is the question of the origin and nature of Essenism. Some consider it a purely Jewish development. Others see here extra-Jewish influences. Within these two views there is another difference of opinion over the peculiarities in which Essenism differs from Judaism and what influences were at work in its origin. There is no doubt as to the relation of Essenism to Pharisaism. Schürer (English ed., II., ii. 210) thinks that "Essenism is merely Pharisaism in the superlative degree." But this is not sufficient to explain the peculiarities. Scholars like Ritschl would explain all peculiarities from the fact that the Essenes wished to be a people of priests. Others, like Bestmann and Lucius, think that in the time of the Maccabees the exclusive pious separated from the temple at Jerusalem and formed a community of their own. For a time Hilgenfeld considered the Essenes Jewish mystics, then again he spoke of Persian or even of Buddhistic influences, but in his later works he returned to his earlier position, and derived them from the original Rechabites (q.v.). Whatever foreign influences were operative, Buddhistic were not among them, though Persian may have been. The philosopher Zeller has endeavored to prove that Essenism has its parallels in Pythagorism (*Geschichte der Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 277 sqq., Leipsic, 1881). Whether it is at all necessary to assume foreign influences depends upon the answer to the question whether Josephus' notes on the anthropology of the Essenes are correct. Whereas Essenism as far as its tenets and mode of life go may be explained from Judaism and may be considered an effort akin to that of Pharisaism completely to attain by isolation purity of life, the Essenic doctrine of man can be explained only from foreign, most probably Pythagorean, influences. But then it can be assumed that other influences also, in which Essenism differs from ordinary Judaism, came from the same sources. Only scanty notices survive about the history of Essenism. The first Essene, Judas, mentioned by name lived about the time of Antigonus c. 110 B.C. (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII., ix.). In the time of Christ the sect seems to have been strong, but every supposed contact of Christ with it belongs to the realm of unfounded hypotheses. When and how Essenism was taken up by Christianity and its adherents were received into the Christian Church is not known. It may be supposed that some joined the Church, though they still retained some distinctive peculiarities. This is probably the kernel of what Epiphanius tells of the Essenes and Sampsæans. In the system of the Clementines Essenic elements are probably contained.

(G. UHLHORN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief sources are: Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, xii.-xiii., Mangey's ed., ii. 457–459, and "Apology for the Jews" preserved by Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica*, viii. 11, and Mangey, ii. 632–634; Josephus, *War*, II., viii. 2–13; *Ant.* XIII., v. 9, XV. x. 4, 5, XVIII. i. 5 (Josephus was in a position to give accurate notices, since he lived near them); Pliny, *Hist. nat.* v. 17. Later literature on the Essenes is extensive, and is best given in Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 556–559, after which follows Schürer's valuable treatment of the subject, pp. 559–584, Eng. transl. II., ii. 188–218. Consult: Frankel. in *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums*, iii (1846), 441–461; A. Ritschl, in *Theologische Jahrbücher*, xiv (1855), 315–356; A. Hilgenfeld, *Jüdische Apocalyptik*, pp. 243–286, Jena, 1857; idem, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 87–149, Leipsic, 1884; J. M. Jost, *Geschichte des Judentums*, i. 207–214, Leipsic, 1857; C. D. Ginsburg, *The Essenes*, London, 1864; J. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 166–175, 460–462, Paris, 1867; Clemens, in *ZWT*, xii (1869), 328–352; H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, v. 370 sqq., London, 1874; J. B. Lightfoot, *Commentary on Colossians*, pp. 82–98, 349–419, ib. 1875; H. J. Bestmann, *Geschichte der christlichen Sitte*, i. 308 sqq., Nördlingen, 1880; P. E. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, Strasburg, 1881; A. Lillie, *Buddhism in Christendom, or Jesus the Essene*, London, 1887; Ohle, in *JPT*, xiii (1887), 298–344, 376–394, xiv (1888), 221–274, 314–320, 366–387; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. passim, Leipsic, 1888; T. K. Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 418–421, 446–449, London, 1891; J. E. H. Thompson, *Books Which Influenced Our Lord*, pp. 75–122, 217–224, Edinburgh, 1891; N. I. Weinstein, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Essäer*, Vienna, 1892; M. Dedie, *Les Esséniens*, Montauban, 1895; A. Regeffe, *La Secte des Esséniens*, Lyons, 1898; *DCB*, ii. 198–208; *DB*, i. 767–772; *EB*, ii. 1396–1400; *JE*, v. 224–232.

ESTES, DAVID FOSTER: Baptist; b. at Auburn, Me., Oct. 18, 1851. He was graduated at the University of Vermont in 1871 and Newton Theological Institution in 1874, and studied in Göttingen 1878–79. He held pastorates at Manchester, Vt., 1874–76, Belfast, Me., 1876–78, and Vergennes, Vt., 1880–83. He was then professor and acting president of Atlanta Baptist College 1883–86, and pastor at Holden, Mass., 1886–91. Since 1891 he has been professor of New Testament interpretation in Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. He has written *History of Holden, Mass.* (Holden, Mass., 1894); *An Outline of New Testament Theology* (New York, 1900); and *Notes on Greek Grammar Illustrated from the New Testament* (Hamilton, N. Y., 1906).

ESTHER, BOOK OF.

The Name (§ 1).
The Story (§ 2).
Character and Date (§ 3).
Historicity (§ 4).
The Festival, Its Name and Origin (§ 5).
Ethics of the Book (§ 6).
Its Canonicity (§ 7).

The Book of Esther takes its name from that of the heroine, which is usually derived from the Persian *sitareh* ("star"), but is probably the same as the Babylonian Ishtar. This identification is supported by the evident derivation of the name of her protector Mordecai (Heb. *Mordekhay*, Septuagint *Mardochaios*, "one who belongs to the god Marduk"). Though this name is rather strange for a Jew so true to his faith, analogies are not lacking (cf. A. H. Sayce, '*Higher Criticism' and the Monuments*, p. 470, London, 1894).

1. The Name.

The scene of action is the Persian court in Shushan in the time of Ahasuerus, i.e., Xerxes. The narrative tells how the beautiful Jewess Hadassah, "Myrtle," came to the court and under the name of Esther was made the consort of the king. In this position she was able to save her people from threatened destruction. A favorite of the king, Haman, having had a dispute with her cousin Mordecai because the latter would not bow down to him, induced the capricious king to fix a day by lot (Persian *pūr?*) on which the Jews throughout the kingdom were to be exterminated. Esther induced the king to favor her people, Haman was executed, and Mordecai took his place in the government. A new edict of the king permitted the Jews to resist the attack, and thus the feared thirteenth of Adar became a day of victory and the fourteenth, in Shushan the fifteenth, a festive day. The festival was called *purim* from the lots. The institution of the celebration is traced to Mordecai and Esther.

2. The Story.

The narrative is harmonious and written with dramatic skill. Chap. ix. 20–28 records that Mordecai reported the events in a letter addressed to the Jews of all the provinces of the kingdom with the request that they celebrate in future fourteenth and fifteenth Adar as festal days, giving presents to one another and alms to the poor. In this institution of the Purim-festival its name is explained from the lots cast at the beginning of the narrative (iv. 7). This section is a recapitulation of the preceding narrative, forming a fitting end of the roll appointed to be read on the Purim-festival. Verses 29–32 are no doubt duplicates and were inserted later than v. 20–28. The writer drew from oral and probably also from written sources some time after the events, because Ahasuerus and Mordecai belonged to the past (cf. i. 1–2, x. 1 sqq.). These passages refute the assumption of Clement of Alexandria, and Ibn Ezra, wrongly construing ix. 20, 32, that the book was written by Mordecai; and the authorship is undetermined. The time of composition can be fixed only approximately. Although the time of Artaxerxes I. has been suggested, matter and linguistic character indicate the latest Persian or the Greek period. The language is permeated by Aramaisms and Persisms, and is otherwise in a state of decay. The book must belong to the most recent part of the canon. That the author wrote in Persian has no warrant.

3. Character and Date.

The historicity of the narrative has been stoutly questioned. It has been held that the book contains a number of anachronisms and misstatements of Persian customs. Ahasuerus has been identified with Xerxes; and from what is otherwise known of the voluptuous habits and capricious whims, of the sudden alternations between favor and disfavor, and the passionate cruelty and the adventurous pride of this despot, the identification is justifiable. Certain other facts, like the Greek campaigns, tally well with the narrative in Esther. On the other hand the account of Xerxes' marriage after the Greek campaign, as recorded by Herodotus (ix. 108 sqq.), is not in harmony with the story of this book. Esther can not be identified with Amestris, whose lofty position makes impossible the no less distinguished dignity enjoyed by Esther according to the Biblical narrative. The historicity of the narrative is also opposed by the existence of a law according to which the king of the Persians in his selection of a wife was restricted to the (seven) noblest families of the Persians (cf. Herodotus, iii. 84). The question then remains, how far Herodotus is reliable. These narratives were certainly orally transmitted with delight, and moreover passed through a noteworthy literary redaction. In this way inaccuracies and exaggerations might easily creep in. Thus according to ii. 6–7 Esther and Mordecai had been deported with Jehoiachin, whereas from their age they must have been [remote] descendants of the prisoners of his time; the statements in iii. 15, viii. 15 of the sympathy of the inhabitants of Shushan for the Jews are too strong to be true. But the substance of the history neither stands nor falls with these details. The main support of the narrative consists obviously of the Purim-feast itself. Outside of the Book of Esther, the feast is first mentioned II Macc. xv. 36 as "The Day of Mordecai." On its origin and celebration cf. also Josephus, *Ant.* XI., vi. 13. The book is considered pure fiction by such modern scholars as Zunz (*ZDMG*, xxvii. 684 sqq.) and E. Reuss (*Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, pp. 581 sqq. Brunswick, 1892–94).

4. Historicity.

Since the word *pur* ("lot"?), the Persian origin of which has not been proved, points to a foreign origin, some have endeavored to trace the Purim-festival as well as the entire narrative to foreign sources: Hitzig recalled the Neo-Arabic *phūr*, "New-year" and the Persian intercalary days *Purdeghān*; he thought that the basis was in some event which happened about New-year, not in the time of the Achæmenidæ but under the rule of the Parthian Arsacidæ, from which language *pur*, "lot," may come. Lagarde thought that the Purim-feast is the Persian festival in honor of the dead, *Farwardigan*, which was celebrated with joy, the Greek name of

5. The Festival, Its Name and Origin.

which, *phourdigan* (used by Menander), coincides partly with the Hebrew, the original of which was *purdaia* instead of *purim*, appearing as a variant in the Septuagint *phourdia*. Since this is not satisfactory, the reference to a Babylonian myth and festival has found more favor. Zimmern would trace a connection of the Purim-festival with the Babylonian New-year's festival called Zagmuku or Akîtu, and identified *pur* with the Assyrian *puḫru*, "totality," "assembly"; the meaning "lots" might be understood from the fact that at the assembly of the gods at that festival the destinies (lots) for the coming year were appointed. As that festival was celebrated in honor of Marduk, the name Mordecai indicated that the Hebrew matter was derived from Babylonian sources. This Jensen endeavored to prove more decisively by the equations: Haman = Humba, Humban, the head of the Elamitic pantheon; Esther = Ishtar; the wife of Haman Zaras = Kirisa, wife of Humba; Vashti = Mashti, a Babylonian goddess. The Babylonian New-year myth, with which was blended the memory of the overthrow of Elamitic overlordship, was then changed into a legend of the subduing of the enemies of the Jews. Finally, B. Meissner thought of the Sakäen-festival which Berosus records, during which a slave, dressed in a royal dress, for five days enjoyed high honors, which suggests Esther vi. 7 sqq. This festival was originally identical with the Babylonian New-year's festival and was blended by the Persians with that used among them (cf. the five *Farwardigan* days). On this occasion Ishtar (Esther) came prominently before Marduk (Mordecai). But in none of these hypotheses do the date and duration agree with those of the Jewish festival. Neither the Persian nor the Babylonian New-year is in the middle of the month of Adar. The word *pur* still remains unexplained, and the identification with the Assyrian *puḫru* is doubtful. It is possible that the Jews may have combined with a foreign festival the recollection of a national event; but the change of a myth into a history so full of vigor is not credible. All their postexilic festivals are based upon historical events. On this account scholars like Ewald and Winer admit a historical kernel of the Esther-narrative, and are followed by Bertheau-Ryssel, Riehm, Oettli, and Driver.

The ethical character of the book was also attacked, earlier even than its credibility. Greatly as it was esteemed by the Jews, whose national consciousness was flattered by the contents, the Christians became here more aware than in any other canonical book of the contrast of Christianity and particularistic Judaism. Luther with his usual freedom expressed a very adverse opinion, Semler's judgment was no less decisive, while De Wette, Bleek, and Zunz call attention to the spirit of pride and vengeance, and to the lack of piety in the book. But these reproaches involve an unjust estimate of the facts. The Jews of the book can not be charged with irreligiousness and impiety. Without the consciousness that God alone could save them and their people from danger, the fast by which Esther and the others prepared themselves for their heroic deed had no meaning; without unlimited trust in the faithfulness of the Lord, the heroic words of Mordecai, iv. 13-14, are inexplicable. The fact that the use of specifically religious language and reference to religious institutions is scanty is not a fault in a book read at a joyous feast, especially when those institutions were not important for the festival itself (cf. Richm, *TSK*, 1862, pp. 407 sqq.). The book is a product of the time when ancient Israel was about to pass into narrow external Judaism, intent more upon its self-preservation than upon the fulfilment of its destiny. The character of the events is purely national and recalls that of the Maccabean period, consequently the Purim-festival can not be equated with the great festivals of Israel, which are more comprehensive.

6. Ethics of the Book.

The canonicity of the book was challenged by the Jews, and the observance of the feast was objected to by eighty-five elders, as recorded in the Jerusalem Talmud. Among Christians the opposition was more lasting. In the Greek Church during the first four centuries it was counted by some (e.g., by Athanasius) among the deuterocanonical (Apocryphal) books of the Old Testament, but the Latin Church gave it canonical authority. The Septuagint placed it at the end of the historical books, enlarged by many additions (see APOCRYPHA, A, IV, 2). Jerome placed these additions at the end of his translation, as "Additions to Esther" among the Apocrypha.

7. Its Canonicity.

C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best commentaries are those by A. W. Streane, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1907; C. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1870; G. Rawlinson, London, 1873; F. W. Schultz, Leipsic, 1876; L. M. de Sacy, Paris, 1882; E. Bertheau, Leipsic, 1887; S. Oettli, Nördlingen, 1889; A. Scholz, Würzburg, 1890; L. B. Paton, New York, 1908. The works on O. T. Introduction are to be consulted. There are able discussions in: *DB*, i. 772-776; *EB*, ii. 1400-07; *JE*, v. 232-241. Special subjects or phases are treated in: P. de Lagarde, *Abhandlungen der . . . Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1866; J. S. Bloch, *Hellenistische Bestandteile im biblischen Schrifttum*, Breslau, 1877; A. H. Sayce, *Introduction to . . Esther*, London, 1885; B. Jacob, in *ZATW*, x (1890), 241 sqq.; T. K. Cheyne, *Founders of O. T Criticism*, pp. 359 sqq., London, 1893; C. H. Toy, in *New World*, vi (1897), 130-145; S. Jampel, *Das Buch Esther auf seine Geschichtlichkeit*, Frankfort, 1907.

On the Purim festival consult: P. de Lagarde, *Purim, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Religion*, Göttingen, 1887; H. Zimmern, in *ZATW*. xi (1891), 157 sqq.; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, Göttingen, 1895; P. Jensen, in *ZA*, x (1895), 339-340; B. Meissner, in *ZDMG*, l (1896), 296 sqq.; Nowack, *Archäologie*, ii. 194 sqq.

ESTHONIANS, CONVERSION OF THE. See ALBERT OF RIGA.

ETHELBERT (ÆTHELBERHT): King of Kent, 559 or 560-616. See AUGUSTINE, SAINT, OF CANTERBURY.

ETHELDREDA (ÆTHELTHRYTH, AUDREY), SAINT: Abbess of Ely; b. at Exning (16 m. w. of Bury St. Edmunds), Suffolk, 630 (?), daughter of Anna, king of East Anglia; d. at Ely June 23, 679. Her father, disregarding her wish to lead the life of a nun, married her in 652 to Tondbert, chieftain of a tribe living among the fens of southern Cambridgeshire, and she received the Isle of Ely as marriage portion from

her husband. After Tondbert's death (655) she lived in seclusion at Ely till 660, when for political reasons she consented to a marriage with Egfrid, eldest son of Oswy of Northumbria, at that time a boy of about fourteen. Bede says that although twice married "she preserved the glory of perfect virginity." When Egfrid came to the throne (671), he sought the aid of Wilfrid of York (q.v.) to induce her to take her proper place as queen, but Wilfrid chose to treat the king's wish as impious and a serious quarrel resulted. About 672 Etheldreda received the veil from Wilfrid's hands at the monastery of her aunt, Ebba, at Coldingham. Her husband gave his consent, but after a year, fearing that she was not secure from him, Etheldreda fled to Ely. There, helped by her old friend Wilfrid, she founded a double monastery and spent the remainder of her life in the strictest asceticism. From her name, popularly corrupted into St. Audrey, comes the word "tawdry," used to characterize wares like those sold at St. Audrey's fair.

Bibliography: Bede, *Hist. eccl.* iv. 19, 20; W. Bright, *Lectures on Early English Church History*, pp. 286–289, Oxford, 1897; *DNB*, xviii. 19–21.

ETHERIDGE, JOHN WESLEY: English Methodist; b. on a farm, four miles from Newport, Isle of Wight, Feb. 24, 1804; d. at Camborne (50 m. w.s.w. of Plymouth), Cornwall, May 24, 1866. He was self-educated, began to preach in 1826, and continued nearly all his life a circuit preacher. Nevertheless his scholarship and learning won him the degree of Ph.D. from Heidelberg in 1847, and he found time to write books of value, the chief being: *Horæ Aramaicæ*, notes on the Aramaic dialects and the Aramaic versions of Scripture with translations of the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews from the Peshitto (London, 1843); *The Syrian Churches, their Early History, Liturgies, and Literature* (1846); *The Apostolical Acts and Epistles, from the Peshitto, etc.* (1849); *Jerusalem and Tiberias a Survey of the Religious and Scholastic Learning of the Jews* (1856); *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel, etc.* (2 vols., 1862–65). He wrote also biographies of Adam Clarke and Thomas Coke.

Bibliography: T. Smith, *Memoir of John Wesley Etheridge*, London, 1871; *DNB*, xviii. 45.

ETHICAL CULTURE, SOCIETIES FOR.

Origin and Spread of Movement (§ 1).
American Societies (§ 2).
Foreign Societies (§ 3).
Aims (§ 4).

The ethical movement had its beginnings with the establishment in 1876 of the New York Society for Ethical Culture. The founder was Felix Adler, who was at the time a lecturer at Cornell University. Unable to identify himself with orthodox Judaism, he felt the need of a movement which should gather together the increasing number of the unchurched of all creeds and denominations and unite them on the basis of ethical endeavor. The key-notes of his inaugural address were the appeal to those present to unfurl a new flag of peace and conciliation over the bloody battle-grounds where religions had fought in the past; the urgent need of a stronger morality to grapple with moral perils of the hour, and the duty of caring for the weak and oppressed and for the moral education of the young. The motto of the new movement was "deed rather than creed," and it at once undertook practical educational and philanthropic work, such as district nursing, aid to crippled children, tenement-house reform, the establishment of a free kindergarten, etc. These initial undertakings have expanded and multiplied, although, in accordance with its general pioneering policy, the society has dropped such work as new public bodies have been established to promote. Its educational work has been its first care. The free kindergarten has gradually expanded until the large school on Central Park West includes elementary, secondary, and normal training departments. During the first ten years of its life, the movement spread by attracting to it four men, who, after serving their apprenticeship in New York, went forth to establish other societies. William M. Salter established a society in Chicago in 1882, S. Burns Weston one in Philadelphia in 1885, Walter L. Sheldon a third in St. Louis in 1886, while Stanton Coit, after having founded the Neighborhood Guild in New York (the first social settlement in this country), went to England and became the successor of Moncure D. Conway of South Place Chapel, London, and afterward the founder of several ethical societies in England and the recognized head of the ethical movement there. Contemporaneously with the establishment of the first ethical society by Stanton Coit, there was established in England a London Ethical Society, among whose members were Bernard Bosanquet, Professors J. H. Muirhead, J. S. Mackenzie, G. F. Stout, Mrs. Sophie Bryant, and among other lecturers, Prof. Henry Sidgwick, Leslie Stephen, John Seeley, and Edward Caird. Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt is associate lecturer of the Chicago Ethical Society, which also includes on its staff of lecturers Prof. Charles Zueblin of the University of Chicago and Miss Jane Addams of Hull House. In addition to the four American societies named, there is a society in Brooklyn, N. Y., and branches of the New York society in the Bronx, Harlem, and Washington Heights. The number of the actually enrolled adherents is 2,057, to which the New York society contributes over 1,100. Various scattered adherents are attached to the movement as non-resident members of the New York society.

1. Origin and Spread of Movement.

The New York society which naturally tends to become a type and model, is governed and administered by a board of trustees numbering thirty and an advisory council of fifty. In addition to its leader, Felix Adler, it has seven associate leaders, viz., John Lovejoy Elliott, Percival Chubb, Leslie Willis Sprague, Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, David Saville Muzzey, and Henry Moskowitz, and as especial assistant Alfred W Martin. Among the more important organizations are: the Sunday School, of which John L. Elliott is the superintendent, and a system of supplementary ethical classes for young men, young women, and adults; the Women's Con-

2. American Societies.

ference, numbering about 300, which is largely responsible for the philanthropies of the society, including the District Nursing Section, the Sewing Society, the Visiting Guild for Crippled Children, the Society for the Study of Child Nature, the Young Women's Union, and the Women's Evening Club; and, finally, there is a Young Men's Union of over 200 members which owns and manages a country home where fresh-air work is conducted, and contributes largely to the Down-Town Ethical Society and the Hudson Guild. Of these two settlements, or neighborhood houses, on the lower East Side, and in the Chelsea district on the West Side, the first has organized well-graded classes for the ethical education of the immigrant population; the other is working for the democratic organization of the neighborhood for purposes of self-help and self-culture. Finally, the classes for adult instruction aim to meet the needs of adolescents, young married people, parents, and teachers. Normal instruction in the methods of teaching ethics is also a distinctive feature of this work.

The American societies are united in an American Ethical Union, which holds annual conferences. Up to the end of 1907 eleven such conventions had been held. The Union is responsible for a Summer School of Ethics, along the lines of that conducted for some years at Plymouth, Mass. It is also taking the initiative in the establishment of a National Moral Instruction League.

3. Foreign Societies.

In 1892, the first German Society for Ethical Culture was founded in Berlin, the chief leaders being Prof. F. von Gizycki and Prof. Wilhelm Förster. Branches were later formed in other German cities, including Munich, Dresden, Danzig, Freiburg, and in 1904 the Vienna Ethical Society was formed. The movement also took root in Switzerland, societies being formed in Lausanne under Prof. Auguste Forel and others and in Zurich under Prof. Frederick W Förster. In France the movement took somewhat different form. In 1891 the Union pour L'Action Morale was started; later it became the Union pour la Vérité. Foremost among those who have been active in the development of the movement is Paul Desjardins. Under the leadership of Prof. Levi-Morenos the Circolo per la Cultura Ethico Sociale was established in Venice in 1893, and societies later sprung up elsewhere; but they have met such severe church opposition that the movement remains in abeyance. Societies have also been started in Lahore, India; Tokyo, Japan; Auckland, New Zealand, and Johannesburg, Transvaal. It is in England that ethical societies have multiplied most rapidly. Twenty-eight societies are included in the Union of Ethical Societies, which has its headquarters at 19 Buckingham Street, Strand, London. Among these are many labor churches, which have a somewhat distinctive character. The Union has conducted a School of Ethics and a Central Ethical Library. It was instrumental in starting the Moral Instruction League, whose aim is to introduce systematic non-theological moral instruction into all schools. Among the affiliated societies which maintain an independent position are the Ethical Religion Society, conducted by Washington Sullivan at Steinway Hall, London, and the Leicester Secular Society, of which F. J. Gould is the leader. In 1896 the first international congress was held at Zurich, when the International Ethical Union was founded. At the third congress held in Eisenach in 1906, the headquarters of the movement were transferred to Berlin, under the secretaryship of Gustav Spiller.

4. Aims.

The aims of the Societies for Ethical Culture are variously expressed, but the one thought that is common to them all is "the primacy and independence of ethics." The Basis of Union of the New York society reads that the object of the society is that of "increasing among men the knowledge, the love, and the practise of the right"; the means to this end being public meetings, the maintenance of a public platform for the enforcement of recognized standards of right, the development of newer and higher conceptions of duty in the quickening of the moral life; systematic moral instruction of the young; the promotion of continued self-education among adults; general educational reform, with stress on the formation of character; the earnest encouragement of all practical efforts tending to elevate social conditions. It is added that the supremacy of the moral end is implied as a truth; and that, interpreting the word "religion" to mean fervent devotion to the highest moral ends, the society is distinctly a religious body; while toward religion as a confession of faith in things superhuman, its attitude is neutral, neither acceptance nor denial of any theological doctrine disqualifying for membership. The most inclusive statement expressive of the general spirit of the movement is that of the International Union which reads: "The general aim of the Union is to assert the supreme importance of the ethical factor in all the relations of life, personal, social, national, and international, apart from all theological and metaphysical considerations." PERCIVAL CHUBB.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The leading periodicals are: For America: *The International Journal of Ethics* (a quarterly); and *Ethical Addresses and Ethical Record* (a monthly). For England: *The Ethical World* (a bimonthly), *Moral Instruction Bulletin* (a monthly). For Germany: *Ethische Kultur* (a bimonthly). For France: *Libres Entretiens.* For Austria: *Mitteilungen der österreichischen Ethischen Gesellschaft.* For Switzerland: *Ethische Anschau.* The literature of the movement consists principally of the following works by the leaders: F. Adler, *Creed and Deed*, New York, 1878; idem, *Moral Instruction of Children*, ib. 1902; idem, *Essentials of Spirituality*, ib. 1905; idem, *Marriage and Divorce*, ib. 1905; idem, *The Religion of Duty*, ib. 1905; W. M. Salter, *Ethical Religion*, Boston, 1889; W L. Sheldon, *An Ethical Movement*, New York, 1896; idem, *An Ethical Sunday School*, ib. 1900; S. Coit, *Neighborhood Guilds*, ib. 1892; idem, *The Message of Man*, Boston, 1906; W. R. W. Sullivan, *Morality as a Religion*, New York, 1899; D. S. Muzzey, *Spiritual Heroes*, ib. 1902.

ETHICS.

I. Name, Concept, Encyclopedic Position, and Method.
Name (§ 1).
Relation to Religion (§ 2).
Dogmatics and Ethics (§ 3).
Relation of Theological to Philosophical Ethics (§ 4).
Sources of Ethics (§ 5).
Method of Presentation (§ 6).
II. History.
The Early Church (§ 1).
Scholastic Ethics (§ 2).
Early Lutheran Ethics (§ 3).
Early Reformed Ethics (§ 4).
Later Protestant Ethics (§ 5).
Kant's School (§ 6).
Schleiermacher (§ 7).
Recent Manuals (§ 8).
Roman Catholic Ethics (§ 9).
Ethics in England and America (§ 10).
III. New Testament Ethics.

Ethics is that branch of philosophy which treats of the theory and nature of moral obligation, and which determines the rules of right conduct, setting forth the moral relation of man to self and others, and aiming to give a philosophical and practical basis of discrimination between right and wrong.

I. Name, Concept, Encyclopedic Position, and Method:

1. Name. The term "ethics" is derived from the Greek *ēthos* (Sanskrit *svadhā*, "self-determination"), which connotes individual peculiarity as well as the individual customs of a person or a community. Originally *ēthos*, as the Ionic form of *ethos*, shared this meaning with the latter, but gradually a distinction was evolved between the two forms, *ethos* denoting rather external habits, *ēthos* spiritual attitude, or character. According to Sextus Empiricus ("Against the Dogmaticians," i. 16) the word "ethics" was first used by Xenocrates, though Aristotle was the pioneer in giving the term a rigid connotation. Thenceforth the word was frequently used in Greek philosophy, especially by the Stoics. Later it occurs in the works of Melanchthon and his pupils, and then in Spinoza; while in recent times the term has been affected especially by Evangelical theologians of the speculative type. The term "morals" is derived from the Latin *mos*, which, related to *modus*, denotes order, both in the sense of "command" and of "habit." Accordingly Cicero used the adjective *moralis* to translate the Greek *ethikos*, and Christian theological terminology adopted the phrase *disciplina* (or *theologia*) *moralis* in the sense defined by Cicero and Seneca. In Roman Catholic theology the term "morals" remained by far the more customary, but even in the older Protestant philosophy and theology it shared its honors with the name "ethics." "Morals" was also a favorite term with the rationalists and the followers of Kant, although it is also employed by theologians of altogether different schools. See Morality and Moral Law.

2. Relation to Religion. The right to existence of a special Christian or theological ethics is justified only on the basis of a recognition of the essential connection between religion and morality. Denial of such a view is the result of an extreme modern ethical empiricism, the principles of which the societies for ethical culture, founded on the basis of non-religious morality, seek to carry out (see Ethical Culture, Societies for). However, a certain independence must be granted to morality in its relations to religion; for moral consciousness is wrongly considered dependent on religion when all moral good is regarded as good solely because God commands it. It should rather be said that God can command only what is intrinsically good, and what has its basis in his own ethical being. In like manner, a certain degree of independence of religion must be allowed the moral life, since morality draws its material in great part from the manifold relations of human life, which result from the natural, moral, and spiritual nature of the individual, as well as from his relations to his fellow men and to nature. Nevertheless, theoretical and practical attempts to establish a non-religious morality must be rejected. Here the source of the moral law is sought in external experience, with the result that pleasure is necessarily made the sole motive of conduct. But, since each individual must decide for himself the measure of his pleasure or pain, all objective ethical norms vanish and the moral law loses its essential characteristic of unconditional validity. In opposition to Kant's exaggerated principle of the independence of the moral law, it should be said that the unconditioned basis of this moral law can be found only in an unconditioned moral will and a divine personality. The unconditional character of moral demands presupposes, however, that the end of moral activity is unconditioned and infinite, while only conditioned finite ends can proceed from the natural relations of human life. Consequently, if these ends are to be moral, they must be subordinate to an unconditioned end, which can be attained only when man rises in religion above the finite to the supermundane. It likewise follows that only religion gives the necessary power in fullest measure for moral activity, since to call forth this power there must be a collaboration of the two factors which religion alone renders absolutely sure, the consciousness of unconditioned moral obligation, and that relation to the unconditioned supreme moral end which transforms duty into personal inclination. Moreover, the desire for moral activity can exist only if there is a belief in the divine government of the world which establishes and maintains a harmony between the natural conditions of human life and the supreme moral end. These statements concerning the dependence of morality on religion, however, apply perfectly only to a religion in which the all-powerful ruler of the world is at the same time the sum total of all good, while the highest good is a supernatural gift of God which binds man to moral activity. Such a religion is Christianity alone, which, as a perfectly moral religion in the midst of a morally faulty world, can have proceeded only from a revelation of God.

In its position in the Encyclopedia of Christian Theology, between the two chief divisions of theoretical and practical, ethics belongs not to the latter, which lays down rules for ecclesiastical practise, but to the former, which has as its aim the scientific comprehension of Christianity as a given quantity. Behind the changing external

forms of Christianity there is a permanent and definite content of truth; and it is to this ideal side of Christianity that systematic theology devotes itself, while historical theology concerns itself with the history of revelation and with the historical development of the Christian Church.

3. Dogmatics and Ethics.

Since the content of Christian truth is religious and moral, the religious elements fall within the scope of dogmatics, the moral within the domain of ethics. Accordingly, it is incorrect to regard dogmatics and ethics, the two components of systematic theology, as a section of historical theology. Dogmatics and ethics should not, as Schleiermacher assumed (*Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums*, 2d ed., Berlin, 1830), merely present historically the doctrines now prevailing in the Church, but should establish as valid truth the permanent religious and moral content of all historical Christianity, especially on the basis of its records of revelation.

The peculiar bond between dogmatics and ethics must be judged by the relation in which the subjects of the two departments, the religious and moral elements of Christianity, stand to each other. It becomes necessary, therefore, to avoid any such sharp demarcation between the two as was carried out especially by certain theologians of the school of Kant, who regarded morality as founded simply in man himself and as autonomous, and therefore independent of religion. Christian morality, however, is absolutely ruled by belief in God, revealed through Christ as holy love; and, on the other hand, Christian belief is morally conditioned in that it is connected with repentance and centered on the good and holy God. Consequently, not only are dogmatics and ethics by no means independent of each other, but they have much in common. They must not, however, be confused, as has been done by C. I. Nitzsch (*System der christlichen Lehre*, Bonn, 1829), E. Sartorius (*Die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe*, Stuttgart, 1861), and others; for both departments of theology have distinctive characteristics, in that dogmatics must proceed from the religious side of the Christian life (in other words, from Christian faith) to God, revealed in his works of salvation; while it is the province of ethics, considering the ethical side of the Christian life (i.e., Christian morality), to set forth moral good, which is realized in the form of human freedom.

Theological ethics is essentially different from philosophical ethics in that it does not seek to further general human knowledge for the benefit of the whole race, but serves first and foremost the Christian Church. It investigates not human morality as a whole, but the ideal content of truth in historical Christianity; and it postulates not merely intellectual capacity, but also the possession of Christian piety to comprehend the life which proceeds from Christian faith. However, within certain limits, the two systems of ethics must approach each other, in proportion as theological ethics becomes more scientific, and philosophical ethics more morally earnest. Such points of contact between theological and philosophical ethics will justify the use of the latter by the former, although there must be an avoidance of any dependence of theological ethics on philosophical, such as appeared in early Christian theology in relation to the Platonic and especially to the Stoic philosophy, since it would be detrimental to Christian morality; while there must be an equal effort to shun any mechanical mixture, such as prevailed in the theology of the Middle Ages between Aristotelian and Christian ethics, since it would be subversive of the unity of the moral life.

4. Relation of Theological to Philosophical Ethics.

From this determination of the relations of theological ethics to the other departments of theology and to philosophical ethics arise certain points of view decisive for the choice of its sources. It is evident, from the close bond between historical and systematic theology, that the history of Christianity makes accessible essential sources for the history of ethics. Out of the entire history of Christianity, the history of the Church is most important here, in that it extends to the present time; and, since the Church has become a collection of religious bodies divided by their creeds, ethics can not disregard these diversities of sect. It is true that the science need not consider all divergencies, such as those between the Lutherans and the Reformed; but since the difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism is a basal one even in the domain of morals, ethics must here assume a confessional character. It must employ the Protestant creeds as the classical expression of Reformation principles, as also other Protestant ecclesiastical literature; but the Bible, as the history of special divine revelation, remains the chief source of all. Theology must consider exhaustively all the various steps by which the component parts of the Bible are connected, both historically and essentially, with the true revelation of salvation, and with its cardinal point, the reconciling and redeeming revelation of God as holy love in Jesus Christ; and it must also weigh the processes whereby these components, connected with the factors just mentioned, receive their divine origin. Thus there arises the need of critical investigation of the Bible itself, as well as of all other portions of historical Christianity, to discover the universally valid concepts of Christianity. The more important, then, does personal Christian consciousness become as a source of ethics. It is, however, incorrect to regard this as the primary source, as does J. C. K. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nördlingen, 1878), for the objectivity of Christianity finds in the experience of the individual Christian only an expression which is circumscribed and obscured. Nevertheless, this experience is important in the critical search for Christian doctrine in the Bible, since it facilitates the selection of the permanent religious and moral elements of the Bible, and renders possible their spiritual comprehension. On the other hand, for those elements of theological ethics which it shares with its philosophical counterpart, it must, like the latter, avail itself of a purely intellectual observation of the nature,

5. Sources of Ethics.

social life, and history of mankind, as well as of a scientific preparation for these observations by means of psychology, political economy, and practical philosophy.

6. Method of Presentation.

In the matter of method the first question that arises is, whether the presentation should be dogmatic or descriptive. While the ethics of earlier Protestantism, rationalism, and the philosophy of Kant, like their contemporary supernaturalism, set forth its subject in the form of moral requirements—that is, in dogmatic fashion, Schleiermacher declared that Christian ethics was a description of that course of conduct which arises from the domination of religious consciousness as determined by Christianity. Among those who followed him in this descriptive method, special mention may be made of J. C. K. von Hofmann. This method has a sort of justification as opposed to a purely dogmatic treatment. The latter has somewhat of an Old Testament stripe, and corresponds to the character of Roman Catholic ethics, which is invariably inclined to separate the moral life from the central root of belief and dissolve it into a multitude of duties individually commanded. But the purely descriptive method is inadequate; for the moral law is not, as Schleiermacher supposed, merely a higher form of the natural law, whose operations can be described with absolute certainty, but is specifically distinguished from it in that it does not work with mechanical necessity, but counts on the freedom of the human will. Since the normal development of the Christian life does not appear absolutely unimpaired in any Christian, normal Christian morality is, in part, simply a matter of moral obligation.

A second, and not unimportant, methodological problem is the arrangement of ethics (cf. J. Köstlin, *TSK*, 1879, p. 622). Formerly ethics was frequently divided into three parts: ethics (the theory of Christian morality), ascetical theology (general practical rules), and casuistics (considerations of individual problems of difficulty). Casuistics must, however, be excluded as opposed to Evangelical principles; while the Kantian division into pure and applied ethics results in empty abstractions for the first part. Many theologians, including R. Rothe, P C. Marheineke, C. Werner, J. P. Lange, and Krarup, have applied to Christian ethics Schleiermacher's division of philosophical ethics into three main categories based on the three ethical principles of moral good, virtue, and duty. This scheme is, however, peculiarly unsuited for Christian ethics, since these three basal principles can not be developed independently of each other in a Christian sense. To proceed from the concept of salvation, as does G. C. A. Harless, who makes the threefold division of the boon of salvation, the possession of salvation, and the assurance of salvation, corresponds in no wise to the character of ethics; nor does a division according to the different forms of human activity harmonize with the essential nature of Christian morality. It is equally inadequate to make a distinction between internal and external, as does Hofmann (similarly C. E. Luthardt, who distinguishes the person, the intention, and the works of the Christian); or as does Köstlin, who makes the classification on the basis of (1) the life of the inner man, and (2) his external activity. F H. R. Frank's division, which distinguishes the development of the man of God as related to himself, to the spiritual world, and to the natural world, is influenced too one-sidedly by the concept of becoming. Far better is H. Weiss's division into (1) premises or factors, (2) the process of formation of Christian morality, and (3) the manifold phenomena of Christian personality both in the life of virtue led by the individual and in the most important relations of social life. The first two divisions, however, are far more closely connected with each other than with the third, so that it is better to combine them into a first general division, to which corresponds the second special division with its two subdivisions of individual and social Christian morality.

[Ethics is the science of conduct. As such it is concerned with the ideal as it has been developed through individual and social custom (see Conscience, § 7). Its function is twofold; first to ascertain the highest word on the nature of the goal of human life; second, to indicate how this may be reached. If the *summum bonum* is conceived as the common good, then the end is social and the individual is both means and end for its realization. Ethics passes by imperceptible gradations into political science and sociology. In distinction from esthetics, which deals with judgments of feeling, ethics is concerned with judgments of ends realized by the will. It depends upon psychology in its analysis of the processes through which motives are constituted and the freedom of the will disclosed, and upon metaphysics for a view of the world in which the human ideal takes its place as a constituent part of reality. Until recently the term "moral philosophy" was used to characterize this discipline in Great Britain and America. Of late, however, the term "ethics" has rapidly gained ground, and is now almost universally employed to designate this subject. C. A. B.]

II. History: The history of ethics as a science can here be sketched only in outline. In the theology of the early Church ethics found no strictly systematic presentation, while the fundamental views of ethics were frequently at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. Together with a morally debasing concept of belief as the receiving of traditional teaching, the tendency arose to enact external legal regulations for the moral life which had thus been robbed of its religious basis. To make matters worse, this legalism was sought only in an ascetic life which renounced the world, so that a double morality, a higher and a lower, was evolved. For the preservation of the moral laws, as well as of traditional doctrine as a whole, a hierarchic organization, united with external authority, was deemed necessary, so that all Christianity was considered essentially a new law. In the West this legalistic tendency was imprinted on the Church under the influence of the Roman spirit. This is first very

1. The Early Church.

characteristically shown in the numerous writings of Tertullian, who had received a legal training, and whose harsh nature drove him to an extreme ethical rigor; while his views were developed by Cyprian in the direction of a hierarchic ecclesiastical organization. A certain deepening of ethics was then introduced by Augustine, who, in opposition to the superficial and atomistic concept of morality as a whole, and of sin as well, based everything in Christianity on the grace of God. From the hierarchic Church with its outward signs he distinguished the invisible communion of saints as the Church to which the promises of God apply, although he did this in a sense and context which made it possible for him to hark back to popular Catholicism. For him also faith was merely the maintenance of the doctrine of revelation as true, so that it became a ground of righteousness in the sight of God only when proved by hope through love; while the essential work of grace was the magic inflowing of this love, or vindication in the sense of justification, whereby it became possible for man to perform works of righteousness, to follow the supererogatory counsels of monastic asceticism, and thus to merit eternal blessedness. These ethical views of Augustine were accepted by ecclesiastical theology, and appear tolerably complete, although slightly coarsened in the *Moralia* of Gregory the Great. They were likewise of fundamental importance for the ethics of scholastic theology and the later Roman Catholic Church. Since, however, it was necessary to prove that Augustine's doctrine of absolute predestination, together with the premises which led to his conclusions, could not be reconciled in the long run with the monastic and hierarchic principles represented by Augustine himself and further developed after him, these elements were interpreted in a Semi-Pelagian sense. The tendency toward an atomistic ethical point of view was favored, moreover, by the establishment of the confessional, which, after the seventh and eighth centuries, called forth the rich literature of the penitentiaries (*Libri pœnitentiales;* see PENITENTIAL BOOKS), together with a casuistic ethics. Among the few systematic ethical treatises written during this period, special mention should be made of those of Alcuin (*De virtutibus et vitiis* and *De animæ ratione*).

2. Scholastic Ethics.

The age of scholasticism, at its very beginning, sent forth the first works on ethics as a separate science under its own name—treatises which were philosophical rather than theological, such as the *Philosophia moralis* of Hildebert of Tours and the *Ethica* of Abelard. Of fundamental importance for later scholastic ethics was the ethical portion of Peter Lombard's great treatise on dogmatics, the *Sententiæ*. The second book treats of freedom, virtue, sin, the will, the seven deadly sins, and the sin against the Holy Ghost; while the third book includes the theological virtues; faith, love, hope, the four cardinal virtues, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, the ten commandments, and the distinction between the Law and the Gospel. Among the many followers of Peter Lombard by far the most important was Thomas Aquinas, who discussed ethics in systematic form in the second part of his *Summa*, treating of general ethical problems in the first section, and of specifically Christian morality in the second. The scheme of the concepts and the basis of this system, a mighty one of its kind, is Aristotelian; the superstructure contains essentially the ethics of Augustine. Thomas was opposed, in a sense, even in ethics, by Duns Scotus (*Quæst.* iv. 49), who emphasized as the basis of morality not, like Thomas, the cognizable inner necessity of reason, but rather the divine and human freedom of the will in an entirely abstract sense. With scholastic ethics the moral system of medieval mysticism stood, generally speaking, not in opposition, but in close kinship. Both centered in Augustine and were influenced by Neo-Platonic concepts, so that both inclined toward a non-ethical concept of God; both served the Roman Catholic Church, except for certain thoroughly heretical divergencies; both were cultivated especially in the mendicant orders. They were even blended, as by Hugo of St. Victor; or were united in the same individual, as in Meister Eckhart, whose Latin writings reveal him as a scholastic, and his German as a mystic. Even where the representatives of mysticism laid aside scholastic dialectics, as did Johannes Tauler and Thomas à Kempis, their mysticism was but the popular and edifying amplification of the thought which forms the climax of scholasticism—the conception that the supreme end of man, which leads beyond Christian belief, Christian morality, and Christian knowledge, is that form of union with God which is gained through emancipation from the finite and negation of the ego. Only in the influence of mysticism on the religious life, which it rendered internally and actively pious, was there any preparation for the Reformation in the sphere of ethics.

3. Early Lutheran Ethics.

Early Protestant ethics was dominated by the principles of the Reformation, which regarded the blessed conviction of justification by faith as the center of all Christian truth, the Scriptures as the proper norm of Christian doctrine, and the communion of believers united by the Word of God and the Sacraments as the essence of the Church. Accordingly, proceeding on these principles, which here stand in intimate connection with each other, it sought to purify Christian ethics from the disturbing elements introduced by Roman Catholicism. Belief was now changed from an acceptance of ecclesiastical doctrine to a penitent, blessed trust in God, revealed as holy love in Christ. Thus faith became the centralized and morally powerful source of all Christian life. At the same time, the Roman Catholic concept of a purely magical foundation of Christian morality as legalism and justification by works was discarded. Instead of an external command, the source of ethical knowledge now became the ideal life as set forth in the Bible, adopted by the Christian conscience, and modified according to the individual. At the same time the distinction between a higher and a lower morality, and especially the commen-

dation of the monastic life, was rejected. Since, moreover, the ethical significance of secular toil and of the natural relations of human society was now recognized, their subjection to the visible Church became a thing of the past. None of the Reformers, however, developed these views into a comprehensive system, although Luther often used them in their basal generality and with strong stress on their religious aspect. His *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* (1520) contains important fundamentals of ethics, while in the discussion of the decalogue in his Catechism he makes naive statements on individual ethical matters.

A stronger and more specific interest in ethics was shown by Melanchthon, not only in his great work on dogmatics, the *Loci*, but also in his university lectures on Proverbs and in brief individual treatises on ethical subjects. Nevertheless, he gave a systematic presentation only of philosophical ethics, discussing natural law as given by God. His *Epitome philosophiæ moralis* (Strasburg, 1538) and *Ethicæ doctrinæ elementa* (1550) long formed the basis of instruction in ethics in the Lutheran Church. Melanchthon's school produced the first treatise on Christian ethics in Thomas Venatorius' *De virtute Christiana libri tres* (1529), which emphasized the moral power of justification by faith. To the same school belong the *Regulæ vitæ* of David Chytræus (1555) and the *Ethicæ doctrinæ libri quattuor* of P. von Eitzen (1572), both, strictly speaking, only exegeses of the decalogue. The transfer from Lutheran to Reformed ethics was made by the *Enchiridion theologicum* of the Dane Niels Hemmingsen (Leipsic, 1568), who was inclined toward Calvinism.

4. Early Reformed Ethics.

With this school of Melanchthon Reformed theology shared a deep ethical interest, although it was sharply opposed to that school in regard to the problem of the freedom of the human will because of its doctrine of predestination. This community of interest was shown even by Zwingli, who developed his ethical views, especially in his *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione* (Zurich, 1525). Much distinguishes him from Calvin in the sphere of ethics, such as his concept of the Church as a community at once religious and civil, his national patriotism, and his joyously human type of piety. Nevertheless, Calvin practically coincides with Zwingli in his general views of ethics. Calvin's ethics is chiefly to be found in the third book of his *Institutio religionis Christianæ* (Basel, 1536), where he regards the Christian life as divine service, or, more specifically, as a sacrifice in the Christian denial of self, dividing the demonstration of the latter, on the basis of Titus ii. 12, into three parts. This basal concept gives his ethics a certain ascetic appearance, while the concept of love is thrust into the background. The first fairly complete system of Christian ethics that came from the Reformed Church was the *Ethica Christiana* of Lambert Daneau (Geneva, 1577). In his *Systema ethicæ* (in *Opera*, Geneva, 1614) another Reformed theologian, Bartholomæus Keckermann, sought to give simply a philosophical ethics. On the other hand, Amandus Polanus, in his *Syntagma theologiæ* (Geneva, 1610), divided systematic theology into dogmatics proper and ethics; and Keckermann was more explicitly assailed by the *Medulla theologica* (Amsterdam, 1623) of the Puritan William Ames, who declared that there could be no ethics except what was strictly theological. A mediating tendency was shown by M. Amyraut, of the Academy of Saumur, in his *Morale chrestienne* (6 vols., Saumur, 1652–1660); but the majority of Reformed ethicists followed Ames in their monotonous exegesis of the decalogue, from which was developed even here a casuistic system (cf. J. H. Alsted's *Theologia casuum*, Hanau, 1621).

5. Later Protestant Ethics.

In post-Reformation theology orthodoxy soon became supreme, laying stress on correct dogmatic opinion rather than on a living faith of moral efficacy. Ethics accordingly declined sharply and was scarcely cultivated, except in the barren form of ascetical theology. An independent scientific system of ethics in the Lutheran Church was first revived by the Helmstädt theologian Georg Calixtus, who, in his *Epitome theologiæ moralis* (1634), described the Christian life as the preservation of salvation which had been won, thus bringing upon himself the charge of orthodoxy that he had, in Roman Catholic fashion, asserted that good works were necessary to salvation. Calixtus was followed by Dürr, Theodor Maier, Rixner, and Johann Andreas Schmidt, while J. W Baier's *Compendium theologiæ moralis* (Jena, 1698) was conducted more in the traditional channels of orthodoxy. The ethics of the eighteenth century was dominated in great part by the rationalism of the Enlightenment (q.v.); although Pietism early gave a fresh impulse to ethics in its practical aspect by laying stress upon the moral fruitfulness of Christian belief. The influence of this tendency on orthodox theology is seen in J. F. Buddeus' *Institutiones theologiæ moralis* (1711). Pietism, however, gave but a scanty scientific contribution to ethics; and the offshoots of the Pietistic movement led to unnatural distortions of the Christian life and to an intensification of the claim of nature to the sphere of ethics. The attempt was accordingly made to formulate a purely human ethics from the philosophical side, positing as the supreme moral requirement the furtherance of the welfare of society (Hugo Grotius, Pufendorf), or of perfection (Christian Wolf). Gradually these tendencies found their way into theology. In his *Theologische Moral* (1738) Siegmund Baumgarten still retained a supernatural point of view, but gave it a philosophical basis; while in his comprehensive *Sittenlehre der heiligen Schrift* (5 vols., Helmstädt, 1735–53) J. L. von Mosheim earnestly sought to prove that Biblical and Christian ethics correspond to reason and nature. This interest in the reasonableness of ethics soon became dominant in theology; while, despite the endeavors of Biblically minded theologians, such as C. A. Crusius (*Moraltheologie*, Leipsic, 1772) and J. F. Reuss (*Elementa theologiæ moralis*, Tübingen, 1767), an ethical eudemonism spread through German theology under the in-

fluence of English deism and French materialism. The representatives of this movement included J. P. Miller, Gottfried Less, and K. F. Bahrdt. J. D. Michaelis followed a similar course in his *Moral* (3 parts, Göttingen, 1792–1802), while F V Reinhard defended a rationalistic supernaturalism in his *System der christlichen Moral* (5 vols., Sulzbach, 1788–1815).

6. Kant's School.

A new trend in the history of ethics was introduced by Immanuel Kant, among whose works bearing upon this subject special mention may be made of the *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (Riga, 1785), *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (1788), and *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Tugendlehre* (Königsberg, 1797). Through Kant's energetic emphasis on the unconditional necessity of the moral law, which transcended all empiricism, the dominant eudemonism was refuted, and a deeper knowledge of evil became possible than had been within the capabilities of the ethics of the Enlightenment. Kant was also in the right in his view of the autonomy of the moral law as opposed to external interpretations of moral authority, even though they be based upon the Bible; but the harshness with which he defended his attitude destroyed the proper dependence of ethics on religion and resulted in a legalistic rigorism. Despite such faults, Kant's basal ethical views were widely accepted in the theology of his period, not only by rationalistic ethicists, but also by such supernaturalists as K. F. Stäudlin and J. H. Tieftrunk; although some, like J. F. Flatt of Tübingen, modified them. Through anthropological investigations, F. H. Jacobi and J. F. Fries endeavored further to develop the Kantian ethics, and they were followed by De Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and L. A. Kähler. A distinct step in advance of Kant was marked by J. G. Fichte's *Sittenlehre* (Jena, 1798), especially in its demand for a desire of the good, and through its establishment of ethics upon the belief in the moral governance of the world. Still stronger was the reaction against the subjectivity of the period of the Enlightenment in favor of a recognition of objectivity in the ethics of Schelling and Hegel. The former, in his *System des transcendentalen Idealismus* (Tübingen, 1800) and his *Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit* (1809), laid down the principle: "Become a being, and cease to be merely a phenomenon." He failed, however, to distinguish the ethical domain from the province of law, and thus ascribed too much importance to the State. Still more one-sided was the view of Hegel, expressed in his *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (Berlin, 1833), since he discovered ethics, as the realization of the rational processes of the world in general, preeminently in the ordinances of natural human society, but left the Church no secure position. In opposition to such metaphysical bases of ethics, Herbart, in his *Allgemeine praktische Philosophie* (Göttingen, 1808) and *Analytische Beleuchtung des Naturrechts und der Moral* (1836), sought to establish the science solely on the facts of experience. According to him, ethics, as a division of esthetics, is to posit the simplest relations which, as being morally beautiful, evoke pleasure, but whose sources are not to be investigated. Herein Herbart doubtless intended to recognize both the unconditionality and the unity of the ethical, but the former quality was threatened by his fundamentally esthetic point of view, and the latter by the division into individual concepts of relation.

7. Schleiermacher.

In consideration of these defects of philosophical ethics, it was the more momentous that theological ethics won its independent importance. The most powerful incentive to this development was given by Friedrich Schleiermacher, who, in his *Monologen* (Berlin, 1800), emphasized the significance of individuality, and in his *Grundlinien einer Kritik der bisherigen Sittenlehre* (1803) laid stress on the concept of moral good. Beginning with 1819, he published a series of treatises of ethical content, while after his death his philosophical ethics was edited on the basis of his lectures (Berlin, 1835), followed by his *Christliche Sitte* (1843). Although the first-named is divided into the theory of the good, the theory of virtue, and the theory of duty, it discusses only the first part in detail. Here Schleiermacher, influenced by Spinoza and Schelling, considers the good as a union of nature and reason; while the corresponding acts are either organizing (employing nature as a tool) or symbolizing (transforming all into a symbol of reason). This antithesis, however, is crossed by the classification of all activity into general and individual, so that both activity and the resultant good become fourfold. The theological ethics of Schleiermacher is distinguished from his philosophical system especially by the fact that it is based not on reason, but on the Christian consciousness, since it seeks to describe activity arising from the domination of such consciousness, and also explicitly considers sin. This attempt, carried out with masterly skill, to permeate the entire sphere of human activity with the principles of Christian ethics has exerted an influence far and wide. Among more recent theological ethicists, Schleiermacher has been very closely followed by K. A. Rütenick in his *Sittenlehre* (Berlin, 1832), which forms the second part of his *Christliche Lehre für Konfirmanden.* The influence of Schleiermacher and Hegel is likewise manifest, despite the supernaturalistic spirit of the work, in the admirable *Theologische Ethik* of R. Rothe (3 vols., Wittenberg, 1845–48), which seeks to transform material nature into a spiritual personality from the point of view of Christian conscience.

8. Recent Manuals.

An attitude closely akin to the mediating theology is represented by H. Martensen, in his *Christelige Ethik* (3 vols., Copenhagen, 1871–1878), I. A. Dorner, in his *System der christlichen Sittenlehre* (Berlin, 1885), and J. Köstlin, in his *Christliche Ethik* (Berlin, 1899). A more conservative and Biblical position appears in C. F Schmid's *Christliche Sittenlehre* (Stuttgart, 1861), C. Palmer's *Moral des Christentums* (Stuttgart, 1864), J. T. Beck's *Vorlesungen über christliche Ethik* (3 vols., Gütersloh, 1882–83), the third (ethical) part of M.

Kähler's *Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre* (Erlangen, 1883), and R. Kübel's *Christliche Ethik* (2 parts, Munich, 1896). Strictly Lutheran are G. C. A. Harless' *Christliche Ethik* (Stuttgart, 1842; 8th ed., 1893), A. Wuttke's *Handbuch der christlichen Sittenlehre* (2 vols., Berlin, 1862), A. F. C. Vilmar's *Theologische Moral* (3 parts, Gütersloh, 1871), the second part of A. von Oettingen's *Socialethik* (2 vols., Erlangen, 1873–74; 3d ed., 1882); J. C. K. von Hofmann's *Theologische Ethik* (Nördlingen, 1878), F. H. R. Frank's *System der christlichen Sittlichkeit* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1884–1887), and C. E. Luthardt's *Kompendium der theologischen Ethik* (Leipsic, 1896). The Neo-Kantianism of A. Ritschl is represented, more or less closely, by W. Bornemann's *Unterricht im Christentum* (Göttingen, 1891), H. Schultz's *Grundriss der evangelischen Ethik* (Göttingen, 1891), W. Herrmann's *Ethik* (Tübingen, 1900), Theodor Häring's *Christliches Leben* (Stuttgart, 1900), and J. Gottschick's *Ethik* (Tübingen, 1907). J. Pfleiderer's *Grundriss der Glaubens- und Sittenlehre* (3d ed., Berlin, 1886) belongs to the school of liberal and speculative theology.

Among the more recent philosophical ethicists an idealism friendly to Christianity is represented by H. M. Chalybæus' *System der spekulativen Ethik* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1850), I. H. Fichte's *System der Ethik* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1850–53), C. Sigwart's *Vorfragen der Ethik* (Freiburg, 1886), G. Class's *Ideale und Güter* (Leipsic, 1886), F Harms's *Ethik* (Leipsic, 1889), and A. Dorner's *Das menschliche Handeln, philosophische Ethik* (Berlin, 1895). The influence of Kant is shown in A. Trendelenburg's *Naturrecht auf dem Grunde der Ethik* (Leipsic, 1860), H. Lotze's *Grundzüge der praktischen Philosophie* (Leipsic, 1884), Theodor Lipps's *Ethische Grundfragen* (Hamburg, 1899), and M. Wentscher's *Ethik* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1901–05). Herbart's point of view is represented by J. W. Nahlowsky's *Allgemeine praktische Philosophie* (Leipsic, 1871; 2d ed., 1885), T. Ziller's *Allgemeine philosophische Ethik* (Langensalza, 1880; 2d ed., 1886), H. Steinthal's *Allgemeine Ethik* (Berlin, 1885), and W. Rein's *Grundriss der Ethik* (Osterwald, 1902). W. Wundt, *Ethik* (Stuttgart, 1886), and F Paulsen, *System der Ethik* (2 vols., Berlin, 1890), show the influence of Positivism and Utilitarianism (qq.v.), and also reflect the teachings of the theory of evolution, as elaborated especially by Charles Darwin, and an ethical relativism conditioned by this theory and represented by H. Spencer's *Data of Ethics* (London, 1879) and Leslie Stephen's *Science of Ethics* (1882). Under such influences there has been a wide-spread tendency, even in German thought, to trace ethical requirements simply to conditions of culture, tradition, inheritance, and utilitarian motives, and to regard them as purely relative. This tendency is represented by Feuerbach's *Ueber Spiritualismus und Materialismus* (Leipsic, 1866), E. Laas's *Idealismus und Positivismus* (3 parts, Berlin, 1879–84), and G. von Gizycki's *Grundzüge der Moral* (Leipsic, 1883). This eudemonism has found its antipodal pessimism in J. Frauenstädt's *Sittliches Leben* (Leipsic, 1866) and E. von Hartmann's *Phänomenologie des sittlichen Bewusstseins* (Berlin, 1878) and *Ethische Studien* (Leipsic, 1898); while a degenerate offshoot of both tendencies is Friedrich Nietzsche's ethics of the "superman" (*Jenseits von Gut und Böse*, Leipsic, 1886), which overleaps all moral bounds.

9. Roman Catholic Ethics.

In post-Reformation Roman Catholic ethics casuistics first bloomed again through the instrumentality of the Jesuits, who cultivated ethics diligently that they might utilize it for advice in cases of conscience. Among the most important ethical treatises of the Jesuits special mention should be made of the works of F Toletus, Thomas Sanchez, Antonio de Escobar, Busenbaum, Alfonso Liguori, and J. P. Gury. Their ethics seeks to render itself indispensable through its subtly developed casuistry, and to become popular by its extreme adaptation to human weaknesses. The latter end is served by the well-known Jesuit doctrines of probabilism, intention and mental reservation. This elasticity of Jesuit ethics, together with its Pelagianizing tendency, was assailed within the Roman Catholic Church especially by Jansenism, as represented in Pascal's *Pensées sur la religion* (Paris, 1670) and Quesnel's *Réflexions morales* (1687). The Jansenists regarded the love of God, evoked by the operation of divine grace, as the one root of moral action, but they were led into gloomy mysticism and asceticism by their faulty comprehension of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. Still more visionary and passive was the ascetic mysticism of quietism, set forth by the Spaniard M. de Molinos (q.v.) in his *Guida spirituale* (Rome, 1675) and modified by Fénelon, but attacked in both forms by the Jesuits.

With the end of the eighteenth century Roman Catholic ethics also came under the influence of philosophy. The Jesuit B. Stattler, in his *Vollständige christliche Sittenlehre* (2 vols., Augsburg, 1791), adopted the philosophical method of C. Wolff; while his pupil, S. Mutschelle, in his *Moraltheologie* (2 parts, Munich, 1801–03), followed Kant, as did F. G. Wanker, G. Hermes, and others. On the other hand, M. Sailer, in his *Handbuch der christlichen Moral* (Munich, 1818), set forth a Pietistic mystic eudemonism, a similar tendency being shown in J. B. von Hirscher's more scientific *Christliche Moral* (5th ed., Tübingen, 1851). Some traces of Schleiermacher's influence are discernible in H. Klee's *System der katholischen Moral* (Mainz, 1847), K. Martin's *Lehrbuch der katholischen Moral* (Mainz, 1850), and C. Werner's *System der christlichen Ethik* (Regensburg, 1850); while a more traditional character is maintained in the ethical manuals of H. T. Simar (Freiburg, 1877), F X. Linsenmann (1879), J. Schwane (1878–85), and Rappenhöner (1889).

F. Sieffert.

[English ethics dates from Francis Bacon (q.v.), who by an empirical method presented the good as the useful. To Thomas Hobbes (d. 1679) the *summum bonum* was self-preservation. In the natural condition every man's hand was against his neighbor; the state is therefore necessary. The

two factors of his ethics were egoistic hedonism and absolute social authority. Since Hobbes ethical thought has taken several directions. (1) **Intuitionalism**, of which there is an earlier and a later school. According to the Cambridge Platonists, Ralph Cudworth (q.v.; *Eternal and Immutable Morality*, London, 1731), Henry More (q.v.; *Enchiridion Ethicum*, 2 parts, London, 1667), and Samuel Clarke (q.v.; *Being and Attributes of God*, 2 vols., London, 1704), the intuitional philosophy was applied to ethics (see CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS). Good and evil are referred to eternal moral ideas a priori. This type of thought was followed by Richard Price (d. 1791; *Review of the Principal Questions of Morals*, London, 1758), by Thomas Reid (q.v.; *Essays on the Active Powers of the Human Mind*, Edinburgh, 1788), by Dugald Stewart (q.v.; *Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man*, 1828), and by William Whewell (q.v.; *Elements of Morality*, London, 1846). To these must be added Henry Calderwood (q.v.; *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, London, 1888) and James Martineau (q.v.; *Types of Ethical Theory*, Oxford, 1885). (2) **Utilitarianism** or hedonism, deriving from Bacon and Hobbes, does not flow in a straight course, but in general to it belongs John Locke (see DEISM), who held that happiness was the ultimate motive of moral action. His great contribution to ethics was his doctrine on power (*Essay concerning Human Understanding*, book II., chap. xxi., London, 1690) which profoundly influenced Jonathan Edwards (q.v.) in his discussion of the will (*A Careful and Strict Enquiry into Freedom of the Will*, Boston, 1754). David Hume (q.v.) in his *Inquiry into the Principles of Morals* (London, 1751) and Adam Smith (d. 1770) in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (London, 1759) resolve the motives to moral action into either utility or pleasure, and find in sympathy the ultimate quality of the moral sentiments. Closely allied with this movement was David Hartley (d. 1757; *Observations on Man*, London, 1749), who by a physiological and psychological method explained the ethical consciousness by the association of ideas, and showed how from the pleasures and pains of sensation are derived the higher pleasures and pains of imagination, ambition, self-interest, sympathy, theopathy, and, finally, the moral sense. Somewhere between the intuitionalists and the utilitarians must be placed Bishop Joseph Butler (q.v.), who in his *Sermons on Human Nature* alleges three principles of action: self-love; benevolence; and conscience, which adjudicates between the claims of the other two. Later echoes of this teaching are heard in America in Nathaniel William Taylor's (q.v.) doctrine of self-love, in Noah Porter (q.v.; *Elements of Moral Science*, New York, 1885), Mark Hopkins (q.v.; *The Law of Love and Love as Law*, New York, 1869), and James Henry Fairchild (*Moral Philosophy*, Oberlin, 1869). The more modern advocates of thoroughgoing utilitarianism are William Paley (q.v.; *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, London, 1785), who derived obligation from the command of another to which one is urged by a violent motive; Jeremy Bentham (d. 1832; *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, London, 1789), who holds the *summum bonum* to be the greatest good of the greatest number, and John Stuart Mill (d. 1873; *Utilitarianism*, London, 1861), who makes the end to be the greatest amount of happiness altogether. According to Bentham, the sanctions of morality are physical, political, social, religious; according to Mill, they are external or internal. Other writers of this school are Henry Sidgwick (*Methods of Ethics*, London, 1890) and A. Bain (*Moral Science*, New York, 1869). (3) **Evolutionary Ethics**—a form of hedonism—affirms in general that society is a developing social organism, the end of which is according to Herbert Spencer (*Data of Ethics*, London, 1879) happiness, according to Leslie Stephens (*Science of Ethics*, London, 1882) health or efficiency, according to Samuel Alexander (*Moral Order and Progress*, London, 1889) equilibrium. Progress is determined by continuous adjustment of internal to external relations (Spencer) or by conflict of idols (Alexander). (4) **Idealistic Ethics** relates conduct to a rational ideal from the point of view of the source, evolution, sanctions, and principles of action. The rational ideal is that of a moral self in social union with other selves in a kingdom of personal ends. Representatives of this view in Great Britain are Thomas Hill Green (*Prolegomena to Ethics*, Oxford, 1883), Edward Caird (*Critical Philosophy of Kant*, London, 1877), Francis Herbert Bradley (*Ethical Studies*, London, 1876), John Henry Muirhead (*Elements of Ethics*, New York, 1892), William Ritchie Sorley (*Ethics of Naturalism*, London, 1885), John Stewart Mackenzie (*Manual of Ethics*, New York, 1901); and in America George Trumbull Ladd (*Philosophy of Conduct*, New York, 1902), George Herbert Palmer (*Field of Ethics*, Boston, 1901; and *Nature of Goodness*, ib. 1903), J. Royce (*Philosophy of Loyalty*, New York, 1908), and A. E. Taylor (*Problem of Conduct*, London, 1901). (5) **Teleological Ethics**—a combination of hedonistic and idealistic ethics in which the will to live the life which belongs to man is the *summum bonum*—is advocated by Frederick Thilly (*Introduction to the Study of Ethics*, New York, 1900) in reliance upon Friedrich Paulsen's *System of Ethics* (New York, 1899, Eng. transl. of *System der Ethik*). Allied with this is William James's *Will to Believe* (New York, 1897) resting upon the premises of pragmatism. (6) As distinguished from Germany, in Great Britain and America Christian as compared with philosophical ethics has received less attention. The subject has been treated under the title *Christian Ethics* by Thomas Banks Strong in the Bampton Lectures for 1895 (London, 1896), by Newman Smyth (New York, 1896), and by William Leslie Davidson (London, 1899). C. A. B.]

10. Ethics in England and America.

III. New Testament Ethics: There is no system of ethics in the New Testament, not even a conscious suggestion of the need for system. The clearest evidence of this is given in the lack of unity in Rom. xii.–xv., the most considerable body of ethical teaching found in the New Testament outside the Gospels. But the conscious need of system belongs to the speculative individual, detached in some degree both from religious emotion and from corporate obligation; and while there is nothing in

the New Testament resembling the Greek systems of ethics, there is none the less a unity in New Testament ethics which lies deeper than the unities of reflection, due to a creative age which was flushed with religious feeling and moral passion.

New Testament ethics, the standard and mold of Christian ethics, is religious to an even greater degree than the ethics of the Old Testament. For the Wisdom literature is in some places deeply tinged with Hellenism; but the Wisdom mood is notably lacking in the New Testament literature, the apocalyptic and prophetic mood being in complete control. Yet the controlling element of Biblical ethics as a whole is the fact and experience of divine revelation. The power and wisdom and goodness of God invade human consciousness, save man from all his doubts and fears, determine the direction and aim of moral passion. The monotheism of the prophet is ethical monotheism. It reveals and defines itself in distinction from Levitical ethics. The essence of Levitical ethics is a fusion of ritual and custom and fixed convention. In its results it gave an appearance of finality to false or imperfect standards of moral value. Against this view prophetism set itself in moral opposition (Isa. lviii. 3–7; Micah vi. 1–8). The pith of experience is the self-revelation of the divine unity within human consciousness and in history. It expresses itself in an increasing emphasis on character. While, therefore, Biblical ethics is necessarily a religious ethics, it casts itself in the mold of a supreme moral purpose. Moreover, the personal and the corporate elements of ethics are inseparable so that the experience of the divine unity draws after it a solid confidence in the ultimate triumph of Israel.

The prophetism of the New Testament is also in debt to Judaism. The unit of thought and feeling in Hebrew prophetism was the nation (Ezek. xxxvii., the resurrection of the nation). Judaism in a measure shifted the center of gravity. In the Wisdom literature the mood and mind of the individual seek expression. In the Psalter the individual finds satisfaction and relief in lyrical poetry. In Phariseeism the belief in individual immortality became a working motive. But along with these gains went a serious loss. Levitical ethics reasserted itself. Insistence on rigid religious conformity became the order of the day. And the pride of orthodoxy joined forces with it in order to chain the moral genius of Hebrew prophetism to the chariot of legalism and externalism. John the Baptist ushered in the revival of prophetism (Matt. xi. 7–11). He put himself in moral opposition to the Levitical ethics of Judaism (Matt. iii. 7–10; Luke iii. 7 sqq.). Christ continued and completed John's work. He took up into his mind and plan the gains of Judaism, but transcended its spirit and its range. The community founded by him was a prophetic community (Acts ii. 14 sqq.; Joel ii. 28–32). It was distinguished by intense corporate consciousness (*adelphos, adelphoi*, in N. T. outside the Gospels 251 times; *hapanta koina*, Acts ii. 44, iv. 32). Hence it was also distinguished by an impassioned eschatology. Thought and feeling set with tidal force toward the triumph of Christ's community (*parousia*). Emotion, wherever found on its high levels, manifests itself in ecstatic visions of the impending kingdom of God (I Cor. ii. 9 sqq.; Speaking with Tongues, Acts ii. 4 sqq.). It is a help to clear thinking to contrast the beginnings and the genesis of New Testament ethics with the development of philosophic ethics in Greece. The work and the position of Aristotle is typical. He was never a citizen of Athens. This typifies the fact that the systematic moralizing of the Greeks does not appear until the state (*polis*) is in process of decay. Hence Aristotle has a marked tendency toward reflective individualism, toward detachment from corporate interests and ends (cf. his discussion of Friendship in the Nicomachean Ethics; also his definition of God, in terms of the speculative reason, as "thinking on thinking," Metaphysics, xii. 9). Christian prophetism, on the contrary, is like Hebrew prophetism, though on a higher level. It is instinctively corporate and eschatologic.

Inevitably, the key-word is hope. In the prophetic ethics of the New Testament hope is not a virtue, but the spring of all virtues. Through Jesus Christ men are born again into a living hope (I Pet. i. 3). They are saved by being brought into quickening touch with the hope of the kingdom of God (Rom. viii. 24). Christ is God's affirmation of the promises made through the Prophets (II Cor. ii. 20). Through him the redeemed mind and heart utter a decisive assent to God's purpose and plan (ib.). The frame and constitution of New Testament ethics is a solid and glowing conviction regarding the religion and moral issues of history. The foundations of Christian hope are laid in faith (cf. Heb. xi. 1; Acts xv. 9). Spiritual and moral efficiency springs from faith (Rom. i. 17). Faith, however, is not primarily an act of the mind; it is perception, appropriation, assent, all in one; and the man redeemed through Christ by faith affirms and proclaims the kingdom of God to be the ultimate reality (see Faith). This aspect of faith makes it the root of love. It is a significant fact that the Pauline trilogy went through two recensions. In I Thess. i. 3 occurs the order faith, love, hope; but in I Cor. xiii. 13 is found faith, hope, love. The Pauline congregations in the midst of Judaism and heathenism are threatened with disintegration, so the unity of the congregation is the tactical unit of the army of the Lord. Love is the constructive power and will that makes deep corporate unity and fellowship possible (cf. Rom. xii.–xv., I Cor. xii.–xiv., Philippians i. 27–28). In the First Epistle of John this view is wrought into the fiber of Christian consciousness. Faith, hope, and love are the rootstock of New Testament ethics out of which grow the specific virtues. Thus, humility is the necessary mood of the redeemed mind looking in upon God in his measureless power and mercy, and looking out upon the immense task of realizing God's kingdom (Matt. v. 3; I Pet. v. 5; I Cor. iv. 7, viii. 16). It is the mood of all profound Christian experience. Joy is the inherent quality of all thoroughly Christian action, because the will of the redeemed man is held within the will of God (Phil. ii. 12 sqq.) and is strenuously working toward a supreme end (Phil. iii. 14). So it becomes a neces-

sary quality in Christian expression (Jas. i. 2; Phil. iii. 1, iv. 4; cf. Acts as a Christian epic).

The enduring moral quality of action is expressed in the virtue of *hypomonē*, happily called by Chrysostom "queen of the virtues." The "patientia" of the Latin and the "patience" of the English version are a poor equivalent for the New Testament Greek. "Steadfast waiting"—for the supreme end, the kingdom of God—comes nearer to it. Since the imminence of that kingdom dominates the prophetic consciousness, the supreme specific virtue is steadfastness in waiting and working for that supreme end (James i. 4; I Thess. i. 3; Rom. v. 4, viii. 25). The words of Jesus (Luke xxi. 19) sum up the matter. The followers of Jesus, through large-hearted devotion to the kingdom of God and through steadfastness in doing and bearing, shall enter into perfect self-possession and eternal life.

HENRY S. NASH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A very extensive and partly classified list of books is in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, III., 2, pp. 812–912, New York, 1905. Other useful lists are in the works of Crooks and Hurst, Cave and Emery given below. On I., §§ 1–6, orienting and defining the subject, consult: O. Pfleiderer, *Moral und Religion*, Leipsic, 1872; J. H. Davies, *Theology and Morality*, London, 1873; J. Köstlin, in *TSK*, 1879, part 4; T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, Oxford, 1883; R. B. Fairbairn, *Doctrine of Morality in Relation to Grace of Redemption*, London, 1888; H. Weiss, *Einleitung in die christliche Ethik*, Freiburg, 1889; C. F. G. Heinrici, *Encyklopädie*, pp. 248 sqq., ib. 1893; G. Simmel, *Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1893; G. R. Crooks and J. F. Hurst, *Theological Encyclopædia*, pp. 481–496, New York, 1894; A. Cave, *Introduction to Theology*, pp. 561–564, Edinburgh, 1896; C. Stange, *Einleitung in die Ethik*, Leipsic, 1901; P. Dupuy, *Les Fondements de la morale*, Paris, 1901; L. Emery, *Introduction à l'étude de la théologie*, pp. 173–178, 629–638, Paris, 1904; O. Kirn, *Grundriss der theologischen Ethik*, Leipsic, 1906. Introductory matter will also be found in the systems of ethics given below.

For the general history of ethics consult: E. Feuerlein, *Die Sittenlehre des Christenthums in ihren geschichtlichen Hauptformen*, Tübingen, 1855; J. A. W. Neander, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, Berlin, 1864; W E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*, 3 vols., London, 1877 and often; A. B. Bruce, *The Moral Order of the World in Ancient and Modern Thought*, New York, 1899; J. Denis, *Hist. des théories et des idées morales dans l'antiquité*, 2 vols., Paris, 1879; H. J. Bestmann, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, 2 vols., Nördlingen, 1880–1885; T. Ziegler, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, Bonn, 1881–87; W. Gass, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, Berlin, 1881–87; L. Schmidt, *Die Ethik der alten Griechen*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1882; J. Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1885; H. Sidgwick, *Hist. of Ethics*, London, 1886; P. Janet, *Hist. de la philosophie morale et politique*, 2 vols., Paris, 1887; C. E. Luthardt, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, 2 parts, Leipsic, 1888–93, Eng. transl., part 1, *Christian Ethics Before the Reformation*, Edinburgh, 1889; L. Stephen, *Hist. of Eng. Thought in the 18th Century*, 2 vols., London, 1892; T. Ziegler, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, Strasburg, 1892; C. M. Williams, *A Review of the Systems of Ethics Founded on Evolution*, London, 1893; O. Tille, *Von Darwin bis Nietzsche. Ein Buch Entwicklungsethik*, Leipsic, 1895; S. E. Mezes, *Ethics Descriptive and Explanatory*, New York, 1901; E. Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. i., London, 1906; L. T. Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution. Study in Comparative Ethics*, 2 vols., ib. 1906; W. Wundt, *Ethicat Systems*, ib. 1906; H. H. Scullard, *Early Christian Ethics in the West, from Clement to Ambrose*, ib. 1907.

On II., § 1, consult: A. Rau, *Die Ethik Jesu*, Giessen, 1899; E. Grimm, *Die Ethik Jesu*, Hamburg, 1903; H. F. Ernesti, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, Göttingen, 1885; H. Sladeczek, *Paulinische Lehre über das Moralsubjekt*, Regensburg, 1899; A. Thoma, *Geschichte der christlichen Sittenlehre in der Zeit des N. T.*, Haarlem, 1879; H. Jacoby, *Neutestamentliche Ethik*, Königsberg, 1899; T. Jordan, *The Stoic Moralists and the Christians*, London, 1884; G. Ludwig, *Tertullians Ethik*, Leipsic, 1885. On II., § 2: A. Rietter, *Die Moral des heiligen Thomas von Aquinas*, Munich, 1858. On II., § 3: C. E. Luthardt, *Die Ethik Luthers*, Leipsic, 1875; idem, *Melanchthons Arbeiten im Gebiete der Moral*, ib. 1884. On II., § 4: P. Lobstein, *Die Ethik Calvins*, Strasburg, 1877. On II., § 6: H. Cohen, *Kants Begründung der Ethik*, Berlin, 1877. On II., § 7: J. Schaller, *Vorlesungen über Schleiermacher*, pp. 181 sqq., Halle, 1844; W. Bender, *Schleiermachers Theologie*, Nördlingen, 1876. On II., § 9: K. Werner, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie*, Munich, 1864; O. Andreä, *Die verderbliche Moral der Jesuiten*, Ruhrort, 1865; H. J. Bestmann, *Geschichte der christlichen Sitte*, part ii., *Katholische Sitte*, Nördlingen, 1885.

On III. consult: H. Jacoby, *Neutestamentliche Ethik*, Königsberg, 1899; W. D. Geddes, *The Phaedo of Plato*, note K, London, 1863; H. F. Ernesti, ut sup., Göttingen, 1885; C. E. Luthardt, *Die antike Ethik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung*, Leipsic, 1887; idem, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, part i., ib. 1888; Eng. transl., *Hist. of Christian Ethics*, vol. i., Edinburgh, 1889; E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, pp. 158–170, London, 1888; G. Matheson, *Landmarks of New Testament Morality*, ib. 1888; T. H. Green, ut sup., chap. v.; C. H. Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, chaps. v.–vi., Boston, 1891; A. B. Bruce, *The Moral Order of the World*, London, 1899; J. A. Leighton, *Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day*, New York, 1907; *DB*, i. 783–789; *DCG*, i. 543–547; *JE*, v. 245–258.

Treatises on ethics other than those mentioned in the text, or translations of some of those mentioned are: A. Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1873; E. H. Gillett, *The Moral System*, New York, 1874; H. Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, 2 vols., ib. 1881–1883; P. Janet, *The Theory of Morals*, New York, 1883; H. Spencer, *Data of Ethics*, ib. 1883 and often; I. A. Dorner, *System of Christian Ethics*, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1887; H. Calderwood, *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, London, 1888; R. L. Ottley, *Christian Ethics*, ib. 1889; W. M. Salter, *Ethical Religion*, Boston, 1889; C. H. Scharling, *Christliche Sittenlehre*, Bremen, 1892; C. G. A. von Harless, *Christliche Ethik*, Gütersloh, 1893, Eng. transl. of 6th Germaned., Edinburgh, 1868; W. Wundt, *Ethics*, Eng. transl., 3 vols., ib. 1897–1901; W. L. Davidson, *Christian Ethics*, London, 1899; G. B. Tepe, *Institutiones theologiæ moralis*, 2 vols., Paris, 1899; W. Wallace, *Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics*, Oxford, 1899; J. A. Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics*, London, 1900; W. Fite, *Introductory Study of Ethics*, New York, 1903; L. Levy-Bruhl, *La Morale et la science des mœurs*, Paris, 1903; E. L. Cabot, *Every Day Ethics*, New York, 1906; H. Rashdall, *Theory of Good and Evil*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1907; L. Stephen, *Science of Ethics*, New York, 1907; T. Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology*, ib. 1908 (Roman Catholic).

ETHIOPIA, ETHIOPIAN CHURCH. See ABYSSINIA AND THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

ETHNARCH: The title of an office which is often mentioned in Hellenistic times. Strabo mentions *strategoi, nomarchai*, and *ethnarchai* among the officials in Egypt in the time of Augustus; and Lucian (*Macrobioi*, xvii.) speaks of an ethnarch Asandros made king of the Bosporus by Augustus. Thus it is clear that the title was not one peculiar to the Jews. Among them it probably indicates a degree of independence; at least, according to Strabo (quoted in Josephus *Ant.* XIV., vii. 2), that is the position held by the ethnarch of the Jews in Egypt. For the Jews in Egypt the office is an indication that they followed their customs and religion as a special race among an alien people. This comes out in the edict of Claudius cited in Josephus (*Ant.* XIX., v. 2). While the statement that after the death of an ethnarch Augustus continued the office seems to contradict a statement of Philo (*Flaccum*, § 10), that after the death of the

genarch (a word practically the same as ethnarch) Augustus established a *gerousia*, this may mean only that a gerousia was constituted, presided over by a plurality of heads. But ethnarch is not substantiated as a general title among the Jews of the diaspora.

It was a title borne by the Hasmoneans (q.v.), in the first case by Simon. His brother and predecessor Jonathan was called by Alexander, son of Epiphanes, *stratēgos* and *meridarchēs*, titles which imply the union of military and civil power. That Simon had in mind a higher title is clear from the connection in I Macc. xiv. 28 sqq., cf. xv. 1 sqq., and the idea of the titles conferred on him as stated in I Macc. xiv. 42 is that of hereditary right. In spite of this, in the case of John Hyrcanus the title failed to follow succession. The coins of Hyrcanus I. mention alongside " John the High Priest " the " Commonwealth of the Jews," or name him " Head of the Commonwealth of the Jews," from which it follows that John regarded his office as less than that of a political ruler, and considered himself the priestly head of a theocratic state. Yet the sense of the well-known anecdote of the encounter with Eleazar, the spokesman of the Pharisees, in which the latter asked John to lay aside the high-priesthood and be contented with the political rulership, implies the position of ethnarch. His son Aristobulus was the first after the exile to take the title of king, in which he was followed by Alexander Jannæus (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. xi.–xii.). Alexandra also assumed the title of queen, and is so called by Josephus. Her son Hyrcanus, when he retired to private life, passed the title of king to his brother Aristobulus. Pompey gave to Hyrcanus the high-priesthood and also the title of king. But a later decree of Cæsar made Hyrcanus ethnarch and high priest, the former title as compensation for the loss of the royal name. Herod obtained from the Roman Senate the royal title, but his son Archelaus was only ethnarch.

Of special interest is the mention of the ethnarch of King Aretas in Damascus (II Cor. xi. 32). It is the Nabatæan King Aretas IV. who is meant, and the ethnarch is not a governor of the Jews but the ruler of the city. This could have been only in the days of Caligula or Claudius, since under Tiberius and Nero Damascus was under Roman control. Paul's flight therefore could not have been before 37 A.D. (JOHANNES WEISS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best discussion will be found in Schürer, *Geschichte;* consult the Indexes. Consult also: J. Derenbourg, *Histoire et géographie de la Palestine*, pp. 67, 450–451, Paris, 1867; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. 30–31, 163, 371, 417, Leipsic, 1888.

ETTWEIN, et'vain, **JOHN:** Moravian bishop; b. at Freudenstadt (40 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, June 29, 1721; d. at Bethlehem, Pa., Jan. 2, 1802. In 1754 he emigrated to America. In 1772 he led the Christian Indians from Susquehanna County in Pennsylvania to the Tuscarawas River in Ohio. He was a friend of Washington, and devoted himself to the care of the sick soldiers in the general army hospital at Bethlehem, Pa. In 1787 he founded the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, to which Congress granted several townships on the Tuscarawas, in trust, for the Christian Indians. He was consecrated bishop June 25, 1784, and stood at the head of his Church till his retirement, on account of ill health, in 1801. He prepared a vocabulary of the language of the Delaware Indians, which has been published by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. T. Hamilton, *Hist. of the Unitas Fratrum*, in *American Church History Series*, vol. viii., New York, 1895; idem, *Hist. of the Church Known as the Moravian Church*, Bethlehem, 1900.

EUCHARIST, yū'ca-rist.

Combination of the Evening Agapæ and the Morning Service (§ 1).
The Early Liturgical Development (§ 2).
The Service in Justin's Time and Later (§ 3).
The Oblation (§ 4).
The Prayers (§ 5).
The Communion (§ 6).
Frequency of Celebration (§ 7).
The Elements (§ 8).
Various Customs (§ 9).
The Heretical Sects (§ 10).

Eucharist is a term employed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, especially in the primitive Church, to which the present consideration is restricted. (For the liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church see MASS, II.; of the Churches of the Reformation, LORD'S SUPPER, IV For the doctrine of the Lord's Supper see LORD'S SUPPER, I.–III.; MASS, I.; TRANSUBSTANTIATION.) In early Christian literature, however, the word is also applied (1) to the prayer of thanksgiving spoken over the elements (in the East; only once in the Latin West, Tertullian, *De oratione*, xxiv.); (2) to the elements themselves; (3) by an extension of meaning, to any consecrated element or *sacramentum*—as in Cyprian, *Epist.* lxx. 2, to the consecrated oil. The application to the entire celebration of the Lord's Supper continued only so long as it was an actual meal (cf. especially Ignatius), and then reappeared only in the Middle Ages.

The eucharistic celebration of the primitive Church underwent a very important change about the middle of the second century. Originally, either as a common meal or in connection with one, it formed a separate observance which took place in the evening, while the congregation assembled in the morning to hear the Word. At the date mentioned these two were fused into one service, a change which made possible the development of the later mass (see MASS, II., 1, §1) and still exercises an influence even upon Protestant liturgical conceptions. The first witness for the combination of the Eucharist with the morning service is Justin (I *Apol.* lxv.–lxvii., written c. 150). Though the famous letter of Pliny (x. 96, c. 113) attests the prevalence of the older custom in Bithynia, the *Didache* (ix., x.) at least for Egypt, and Clement (I Cor. xliv.) for Rome, Justin shows the new as universally adopted, even if the old for a while existed alongside of it. The grounds for the change have been sought in the accusations of the pagans, who charged the Christians with the commission of hideous abominations at their *agapæ*. But this is an improbable theory; both the evening *agapæ*

1. Combination of the Evening Agapæ and the Morning Service.

and the pagan calumnies still continued after this. It is more likely that both religious and practical reasons brought about the change. The earlier manner of celebrating the Eucharist endangered the unity of the local church, and did not accord with the growing importance of the priesthood. Where these meetings had often been held independently in private houses, the aphorism of Ignatius—"no lawful Eucharist without the bishop" (*Smyrn.* viii. 1)—now prevailed. At the morning service the clergy were assembled, the Scriptures were solemnly read; a natural center of unity for the local church was here, and the religious development was met by the change, as well as the practical difficulty of assembling widely scattered members for both services.

2. The Early Liturgical Development.

In studying the liturgical development, the earliest stage is wrapped in obscurity. Exclusive of the Gospel narratives of the institution (see LORD'S SUPPER, Introduction and I.), the only sources are I Cor. xi. 20 sqq. and the ninth, tenth, and fourteenth chapters of the *Didache*. The traditional interpretation of the Pauline passage (still upheld by Harnack, Zahn, and others) regards the Eucharist as the conclusion of a meal taken in common, or *agape*. A more modern view, held by Jülicher, Spitta, Haupt, and Hoffmann, holds that the reference of the passage is to one single meal, designated as a whole by the name "Lord's Supper." This theory is borne out by the fact that Ignatius uses the terms *agapē* and *eucharistia* indiscriminately for one and the same sacred feast (*Smyrn.* viii. 2, vii. 1; *Rom.* vii. 3; perhaps also *Philad.* iv.; *Eph.* xiii. 1). But this still leaves the question open as to the manner in which this feast was conducted. Since Christ had left no precise ritual directions, the first Christians were free to arrange their Eucharist as seemed best to them. The most natural thing was to follow the traditions of the sacred meals of Judaism. Of these the most natural choice would have been the Passover supper, if it is assumed that the institution took place on this occasion; but even with this assumption neither I Cor. xi. nor the *Didache* shows any relation between the two, and none is forced upon us by such passages as I Cor. x. 6, v. 7. It seems more probable that a model was sought in the most common of these observances, the Sabbath meal as it was celebrated in every Jewish house at the beginning of the Sabbath on Friday night. We can get an idea of it from the Mishnah (especially *Berakot* vi.–viii.), which shows that it was marked by unity and characterized by the partaking of a blessed cup and blessed bread. At the beginning of the meal the cup, blessed with prayer by one of the family, preferably the father, was handed round —though this blessing might come later, and, indeed, the cup be dispensed with altogether. Then the bread was blessed which was broken and eaten during the meal; and a thanksgiving followed, to which the company responded with "Amen," and after the meal, in which no "stranger" might take part, there was another thanksgiving. The dependence of the eucharistic form on this observance is supported by the *Didache*, where (ix., x.) is found the same sequence of customs: after the act of reconciliation, the so-called *exomologesis* (xiv.), the blessing of cup and bread by a short prayer (ix.), common participation (Gk. *emplēsthēnai*, x. 1), and a final thanksgiving (x.). The formulas of blessing are indeed purely Christian, but the double blessing of cup and bread, and the placing of the cup first, point clearly to a Jewish origin. Like the Sabbath meal, again, the whole ceremony is one; the contention of Zahn, Weizsäcker, and Haupt that the prayers for the *agape* are found in chapter ix. and those for the Eucharist in x. can not be upheld. The partaking of the consecrated elements was not (as has been supposed from a misunderstanding of I Cor. xi.) the final but the initial act; it was the blessing of the bread and wine that made the meal "the Lord's Supper." Inquiring how the unity was dissolved, it appears that the reception of the consecrated elements at the beginning became more and more the principal thing, while, on the other hand, the subsequent meal became more and more an *agapē*, or act of charity on the part of the rich believers toward their poorer brethren. This, deprived of its most significant accompaniment, for which the later *eulogia* (q.v.) offered an insufficient equivalent, gradually decayed and perished, while the Eucharist lived on with power in its new form, took precedence of the service of Scripture-reading and preaching, and finally, as the mass, became the supreme act of worship.

3. The Service in Justin's Time and Later.

But meanwhile, when it was united with the other service, of Scripture-reading and prayer, it naturally took with it the essential forms which had up to that time constituted it. Some notable changes took place; the two prayers of blessing on the elements were fused into one, and the offering of the bread and wine, by members of the church, now took on the dignity of a liturgical function. What the order of the various parts was at this period we learn from Justin to have been as follows: (1) the kiss of peace; (2) the oblation (Gk. *prosphora*); (3) the eucharistic prayer of the "president" (Gk. *proestōs*), i.e., the bishop, with intercessions, and the response "Amen"; (4) the communion; (5) the payment of the congregation's contribution (*stips*), and distribution to the poor. The last was dropped in later times, and a responsory (preface) added, which may, indeed, have been in use as early as Justin, though he does not mention it. But the same groundwork continues to show itself, e.g., in Tertullian and Cyprian. Thus, too, about 348, Cyril of Jerusalem describes substantially the same order: (1) the washing of the hands of the bishop and presbyters; (2) the kiss of peace; (3) preface with *Trisagion* and *Epiklesis*, or invocation of the Holy Spirit; (4) intercessions; (5) Lord's Prayer; (6) communion; (7) final prayer. As to the later detailed development, see MASS, II.

We must now consider more definitely the individual parts of this primitive service. After the kiss of peace (q.v.) came the oblation, which was

performed by the deacons receiving the offerings and carrying them to the bishop. When they were numerous, special tables were necessary to hold them, which stood on each side of the altar. Besides bread and wine there were present other kinds of food, such as milk, oil, honey, etc., which were used for the support of the poor. These gifts were blessed, and the givers commemorated by name. As the first spontaneous generosity languished and the Old Testament was increasingly taken as a model, the offering of all kinds of first-fruits was insisted on. The disturbance to the service caused by the bringing of these various offerings gave rise to attempts to limit them, at the beginning of the fourth century, to bread and wine, or other things used in ecclesiastical functions, such as oil for the holy unction, milk and honey for the reception of neophytes, and the like. In the time of Chrysostom scarcely anything but bread and wine was brought (cf. Augustine, *Serm.* lxxxii. 3, 5), and the offering was not made every Sunday by all the members, but on special festivals and in honor of the departed. The church provided the bread and wine from its own resources.

4. The Oblation.

The central prayer (originally prayers), as is seen from the *Didache* (ix.), at first contained thanksgiving for both bodily and spiritual nourishment, in free adaptation of the ordinary Jewish formularies referred to above. Later this prayer was broken by the *Trisagion* (from Isa. vi. 3), sung by the congregation. Tertullian is the first evidence for this; Origen seems to have known it; in the time of Athanasius it was in general though not universal use, in both East and West. It arose probably in Syria, where the liturgies show a really organic connection between it and the prayer which it follows. This prayer usually contains a thanksgiving for the benefits of redemption, leading up to a recitation of the words of institution. That these formed a part of the earliest Christian liturgy can not be safely concluded from I Cor. xi. 23 sqq.; but it is possible that the custom was known to Justin, as it certainly was to Origen, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Chrysostom; and no ancient liturgy has been preserved which does not contain these words. Under the influence of I Cor. xi. 26, there followed what was called the *anamnesis* or commemoration, and then the *anaphora*, in which the consecrated elements were offered up to God; and next came the *epiklesis* (q.v.). The actual consecration was never considered to take place through the words of institution alone before Augustine and Ambrose, but was attributed to the entire eucharistic prayer—though the view is also found that the *epiklesis* has this power. Whether the *exomologesis* or acknowledgment of sin originally preceded or followed the eucharistic prayer can not be determined; later it came after, and was usually connected with the *epiklesis*. From the third or fourth century on, a great intercession for the whole church followed. It is found in Cyril of Jerusalem and elsewhere, but not in Tertullian or Cyprian. It also had its origin probably in Syria, as it is not found in the oldest Egyptian liturgy known. The use of the Lord's Prayer as a part of the liturgy seems to have been known to Tertullian and Cyprian, but is first certainly attested by Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Jerome. It is not mentioned in the Apostolic Constitutions.

5. The Prayers.

The actual communion, as long as the Eucharist had the form of a real meal, was accomplished by the passing of the consecrated elements from hand to hand. When it became a formal act, it was prefaced (demonstrably as early as the end of the second century) by the bishop saying, "Holy things to holy persons" (from the Septuagint version of Lev. xxiv. 9; cf. Matt. vii. 6). The congregation answered, "One alone is holy," etc., and then approached the altar, where they received the elements in their hands, standing. Great care was exercised to prevent a crum of the hallowed bread or a drop of the consecrated wine falling to the ground; in the reception of the former it was usual to place the left hand under the right in the form of a cross. The careful washing of the hands before communion was prescribed; and Cyril of Jerusalem instructs his catechumens to receive the chalice bowing low. The distribution of the elements was performed in Justin's time by the deacons; but this function was withdrawn from them with the gradual growth of reverence for the elements and belief in priestly dignity and power. As a transitional stage, the deacons are found in some places entrusted with the administration of the chalice, as the less important. When a definite formula of administration came in is uncertain, though there are no traces of one in the apostolic age. The oldest was the simple statement; the formula is *Hoc est corpus Christi, Hic est sanguis Christi.* In the Apostolic Constitutions (VIII., xiii. 4) "body of Christ" for the bread, and "blood of Christ, cup of life" for the cup. In Mark the Hermit (c. 410) a longer formula occurs: "the holy blood of Jesus Christ for life eternal"; and in seventh-century Gaul a still further expansion, "May the Body and Blood of our Lord bring to thee remission of sin and eternal life" (Council of Rouen, can. ii.). Each communicant answered "Amen," as an expression of faith. That the earliest use was to give first the cup and then the bread is shown by the *Didache*, and possibly by Luke xxii. 17 and I Cor. x. 16.

6. The Communion.

Only baptized Christians could receive the communion; this was a universal principle from the beginning. Heretics, schismatics, and unreconciled penitents were also excluded, though it was sometimes given to the lapsed when dying. It was the general practise to give it to children. The custom of placing it in the mouth of dead persons must have been deeply rooted, to judge from the number of councils which found it necessary to prohibit it (see Communion of the Dead). Fasting communion is an old and quite universal practise, in fact, a church law, which was referred to apostolic command by Augustine; an exception was made on Maundy Thursday, when the Eucharist was celebrated in the evening. Much emphasis was laid, following Lev. vii. 20 and I Cor. xi.

27, upon purity of body and soul as a preparation for communion. Chrysostom, who is specially strong on this point, requires a particular preparation by penance, prayer, almsgiving, and spiritual exercises, lasting for days.

7. Frequency of Celebration.

As to frequency of celebration, the most which can be said for the primitive age with any certainty is that it occurred at least every Sunday, and there is plenty of proof for this in the second century. The tendency was toward greater frequency, and days of religious observance (Saturdays, fast-days, the anniversaries of martyrs) were thus marked. Daily celebration became customary in the West, by the beginning of the third century in Africa, as evidenced by Cyprian; in Rome at least in the time of Jerome, or much earlier if we are to accept as genuine the fragments on Proverbs ascribed to Hippolytus. For Spain the same evidence is given by Jerome; for Gaul by Cassian; for Milan by Ambrose. In the East (except Egypt), Sunday and Saturday were the regular days. But here, too, greater frequency began to prevail. According to Basil (*Epist.* xciii.) the rule at Cæsarea in Cappadocia was four times a week, and he was anxious to see it daily. In Egypt and the Thebaid the Sunday celebration remained the rule for a long time, though an expression of Cyril of Alexandria implies that by his time the Western practise was coming in.

8. The Elements.

The elements used in the Eucharist were bread and wine, everywhere throughout the Church. The bread was common leavened wheat bread, made in little round loaves, with a cruciform incision to facilitate breaking (see ALTAR BREAD). The wine, whether white or red, was mixed with water. Cyprian mentions (*Epist.* lxiii.) as a widespread African custom the reception of pure water and no wine at all. But this practise, which is neither primitive nor based on ascetic principles but simply an exaggerated insistence on the prevalent custom of drinking no wine in the morning, never spread further and died out completely. Milk, honey, and salt were used at various times (for the salt, cf. the Clementine Homilies, xiv. 1). The use of milk and honey is first mentioned in connection with the communion of neophytes. A similar custom—a purification by honey—occurs in the Mithra cult; but it could hardly have come from that source into Christian usage if passages like Jer. xi. 5 and Ezra xx. 6 (cf. also Isa. lv. 1) had not seemed to commend it. From the neophytes' communion the custom spread into more general use; sometimes honey was mixed with the wine (Council of Auxerre, 585 or 578, can. v.); or milk was substituted for wine, as in the old Spanish provinces of Gallacia and Asturia, where wine was scarce (Fourth Council of Braga, about 675, can. ii., cf. also can. lvii. of the Second Trullan Council, 692).

A regular reception every Sunday was undoubtedly the normal custom of the primitive age. This is evident, if from nothing else, from the statement of Justin (*I Apol.* lxvii.) that the consecrated elements were carried by the deacons to the houses of those who could not be present at the celebration. The practise of the whole congregation communicating, which continued into the third century, disappeared with surprising rapidity in the fourth. Chrysostom complains more than once of the fewness of communicants; Eusebius of Emesa rebukes those who leave the church before the communion, and such persons are threatened with excommunication by the Apostolic Canons (ix.) and the Council of Antioch (341, can. ii.). In the East the custom gradually prevailed of receiving the sacrament only once a year, Easter and Epiphany being the most usual days. In the West more frequent communion remained usual. Not a few early councils, indeed, in Gaul and Spain (e.g., Elvira, 305; Toledo, 398 or 400; Agde, 506) threatened with penalties those who abstained from communion; but this was directed against cryptic sects, whose members came to church, but had their own communion in their secret meetings. For the vessels used in the celebration, see VESSELS, SACRED.

9. Various Customs.

It seems to have been first in the West that the custom grew up of carrying home either fragments of the consecrated bread or the whole portion received, in special little boxes called *arcæ* (Tertullian, Cyprian). Basil attests the existence of the same custom in Egypt, and it must have spread rapidly. With these particles a sort of domestic celebration would be performed (Council of Laodicea, can. lviii.; of Gangra, about 350, can. x.; of Toledo, 400, can. xiv.). They were also carried about the person as a protection against dangers, as shown by the evidence of Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzen. To the sick and to prisoners the Eucharist was carried not only by priests but by laymen and even women.

The commemoration of the death-anniversaries of the martyrs took place at their graves, and can hardly have consisted in anything but the Eucharist. The custom became more general with the fourth century, and altars were erected over the graves. The practise must also have soon arisen of commemorating the other dead either on the third (ninth, fortieth) day after death or on the anniversary.

10. The Heretical Sects.

As to the eucharistic celebration among the early sects not much information has been handed down. Relatively the most is known about the Gnostics. In the *Pistis Sophia* a description is given of a function which it is hard to identify as eucharistic or baptismal, so much have the two sacraments been fused into one. Substantially nearer to the practise of the Church are the celebrations described in the *Acta Thomæ* and *Acta Johannis;* here the Eucharist is an independent function, separate from the *agape*, and taking place in the morning, but not connected with the Scripture-reading and preaching service; here too appear the oblation, the prayer of consecration, the breaking of the bread, and the administration with a definite formula, to which the receiver responds with "Amen." But there is a doubt how far these originally Gnostic writings have been changed by

Catholic revision. The consecration among the Gnostics was effected not by the recital of the words of institution but by a prayer (of thanksgiving in the *Acta Johannis*, of supplication to Christ for a blessing on the feast in the *Acta Thomæ*, while there is an *epiklesis* in Irenæus I., xiii. 2 and in another part of the *Acta Thomæ*). What is known of the Eucharist among the other sects is confined almost entirely to the elements used by them. Water replaced wine very generally outside the Gnostic circles. Epiphanius relates that some bodies (*Encratitæ*, *Apostolici*) used bread, salt, and water; and he and Augustine both say that the Montanists used bread and cheese, without wine —customs which point to the original status of the Eucharist as an actual meal. (P. Drews.)

Bibliography: On the Roman Catholic side: C. de Burguera, *Enciclopédia de la eucaristia*, 7 vols. Estepa, 1905–07; E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, part i., Antwerp, 1736; J. J. I. Döllinger, *Die Lehre von der Eucharistie in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, Mainz, 1826; F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien*, Tübingen, 1872; G. Bickell, *Messe und Pascha*, Mainz, 1872; idem, in *ZKT*, 1880; F. S. Renz, *Opfercharakter der Eucharistie . . . der ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Paderborn, 1892; J. Wilpert, *Fractio panis, die älteste Darstellung des eucharistischen Opfers*, Freiburg, 1895 (cf. G. Ficker, in *GGA*, 1896, pp. 685 sqq.); F. X. Funk, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*, vol. i., Paderborn, 1897; T. W Drury, *Elevation in the Eucharist, its Hist. and Rationale*, New York, 1907; W. C. E. Newbolt, *The Sacrament of the Altar*, ib. 1908. From the Protestant point of view: Bingham, *Origines*, books xiii., xv.; H. Alt, *Der christliche Kultus*, i. 184 sqq., Berlin, 1851; T. Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, iv.–v., Schwerin, 1858–59; A. P. Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, chaps. iv.–vi., London, 1881; H. A. Köstlin, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes*, Freiburg, 1887; H. Achelis, *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, in *TU*, vi. 4, 1891; C. von Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, Freiburg, 1892, Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1894–95; G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, Göttingen, 1894; A. C. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 68–69, 536–537 et passim, New York, 1897; S. Cheetham, *Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*, Lectures iii.–iv., London, 1897; C. Clemen, *Der Ursprung des . Abendmahls*, Leipsic, 1898; Harnack, *Dogma*, vols. i–ii.; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 323–335, 647–649, ii. 361–369; Schaff, *Christian Church*, i. 472–475, ii. 201–205; Moeller, *Christian Church*, i. 70, 122, 268 sqq.

From the liturgical side: F. Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte*, Tübingen, 1870; C. E. Hammond, *Ancient Liturgy of Antioch*, Oxford, 1879; Harnack, in *TU*, ii. 1 and 2, 1886, cf. *TU*, vi. 4, pp. 39 sqq.; F. E. Brightman and C. E. Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896; Catergian, *Die Liturgien bei den Armeniern*, Vienna, 1897; F. E. Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, 1897. Consult also the literature under Lord's Supper; Liturgics; Mass; Mozarabic Liturgy.

EUCHARIUS, SAINT. See Treves.

EUCHELAION, yūk″el-ê′ən: In the Greek Church, the "prayer oil," consecrated by seven priests, and used for the unction of the sick, which is counted one of the seven sacraments of the Church, and corresponds to the extreme unction of the Roman Church, but is not limited to cases of mortal illness. See Extreme Unction.

EUCHERIUS: Bishop of Lyons, where he was born and where he died between 449 and 455. Although married and a father, he retired before 426 to the monastery of Lérins, where his sons were educated by Hilary, Salvian, and Vincent of Lérins. Among his friends were such prominent contemporaries as John Cassian, Claudianus Mamertus, and Sidonius Apollinaris. As the author of the *De laude eremi*, written between 426 and 429, he advocated the same zealous asceticism which he observed together with his wife, according to the custom of the time, on the island of Lero (the modern St. Marguerite). Other monastic writings were also composed by him, including the *Exhortatio ad monachos*, the *Sententia ad monachos*, and the *Admonitio ad virgines*, and the despair with which the conditions of the time filled him is expressed in his *De contemptu mundi et sæcularis philosophiæ*. The first book of his *Instructiones* evidences his knowledge of the Biblical criticism of his period, and the second forms a dictionary of antiquities for the elucidation of the loan-words in the Bible. The *Formulæ spiritalis intelligentiæ* contains historical, figurative, and analogical interpretations of Biblical designations in the realm of nature and human life. In the Pelagian controversy he seems to have regarded the coexistence of God and man in Christ as analogous with the union of body and soul in humanity, while his deep interest in the heroes of Christendom found expression in the *Passio Agaunensium martyrum*. His letter to Philo, in which he voluntarily assumed the charge of certain ecclesiastical institutions, like his letter to the presbyter Faustus *De locis aliquibus sanctis*, is of doubtful authenticity. Eucherius was closely associated with the neighboring bishops, and on Nov. 8, 441, presided with Hilary of Arles over the first Synod of Orange. No details are known of his administration of his bishopric, and even the year of his consecration, which was 434, according to Sigibert of Gembloux, is uncertain.

(Edgar Henneke.)

Bibliography: The *Opera* were published by Brassicanus, Basel, 1531; in *MPL*, l.; and, ed. Wotke, in *CSEL*, xxxi., 1894. Sources for a life are: *Chronica Gallica*, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, ix. 1 (1892), 662; Salvianus of Marseilles, in the same, i. 1 (1877), 109–110, 116; Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, xxviii. Consult: A. Mellier, *De vita et scriptis . . Eucherii*, Paris, 1878; A. Gouilloud, *Saint Eucher, Lérins et l'église de Lyon au 5. siècle*, Lyons, 1881; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, p. 1170, § 457, no. 6, Leipsic, 1890.

EUCHITES. See Messalians.

EUCHOLOGION, yū″cə-lō′ji-ən: A name which in Greek signifies any collection of prayers, but is most usually applied to the Great Euchologion or Prayer-Book of the Eastern Church, which contains the rites for all the principal ecclesiastical functions. It includes also a great number of benedictions for all the material objects which are commonly blessed in the traditional or catholic system, for the fruits of the earth, and for various callings in life which are supposed to need special blessing. The book is of the highest interest for the study of the Eastern Church, the life of which from the beginning it represents in one way or another. It has been preserved in a number of manuscripts. The first printed edition was that of 1526; the oldest known to be extant is the 1545 edition in the royal library at Munich. Later official editions have appeared in Venice, Bucharest, Athens, and Constantinople; these are the best for scientific study of the Greek Church and its liturgical usages. (Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: W Cave, *Script. eccl. historia literaria*, Dissertation ii., Oxford, 1743; J. M. Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, London, 1850; E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, Paris, 1885; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 658–659.

EUDES, yūdz or (Fr.) ūd, JEAN, AND THE EUDISTS: French Roman Catholic priest and the Congregation founded by him. Eudes was born at Mezerai, southern Normandy, Nov. 14, 1601; d. at Caen (149 m. w.n.w. of Paris) Aug. 19, 1680. He was educated at the Jesuit college in Caen and at the Oratory in Paris under Bérulle, where he was ordained priest in 1626.

Eudes distinguished himself by his care of the sick during times of plague and as a missioner, and in 1639 became superior of the Congregation of the Oratory at Caen. Four years later, however, he left the Oratorians, and with five companions founded the Congregation of the Missionary Priests of Jesus and Mary, or Eudists, which substituted for monastic vows the vow of strict obedience and received the official sanction of the bishop of Bayeux in 1644. The object of the Congregation was to provide a corps of educated secular priests for the special purpose of holding missions among the people, and during Eudes's administration of thirty-seven years as superior-general it spread throughout Normandy and a portion of Brittany, while seminaries were founded on the model of the mother house in Rouen, Evreux, Lisieux, Coutances, and Rennes. Under the immediate successor of Eudes, Blouet de Camilly, additional seminaries were established at Avranches, Dol, Senlis, and Paris, while under Guy de Fontaines (d. 1727) and Pierre Cousin (d. 1751) the Eudists, together with the Jesuits, strongly opposed Jansenism. Up to the outbreak of the Revolution the Eudists were one of the most respected and influential Congregations of Roman Catholic France, and possessed a college at Paris, in addition to twelve large and five small seminaries, while Father Hébert, the superior of the Paris house, was the confessor of Louis XVI.

Despite the suppression of the Congregation during the Revolution, it was quietly revived in 1800 by Toussaint Blanchard in the seminary at Rennes, and was formally reorganized in 1826. It has consistently maintained its pronounced Ultramontanism, and since the middle of the nineteenth century has been active in foreign missions. Eudes himself not only founded the Congregation which bears his name, but also the Daughters of Our Lady of Charity of the Refuge, the prototype of the modern sisterhoods of the Good Shepherd, and was likewise active in spreading devotion to the hearts of Jesus and Mary, thus preparing the way for the later Congregations devoted to this purpose (see Sacred Heart of Jesus, Devotion to). Since 1874 the Eudists have earnestly striven to secure the canonization of their founder. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: C. de Montzey, *Le Père Eudes et ses instituts*, Paris, 1869, Eng. transl., 2d ed., London, 1883; A. le Doré, *Les Vertus du Jean Eudes*, Paris, 1872; idem, *Les Sacrés Cœurs et . Jean Eudes*, ib. 1891; A. Pinas, *La Vénérable Père Endas et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1901; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, viii. 159–168; Hembucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 384–385, 423, 450–451; *KL*, iv. 954–958; Currier, *Religious Orders*, p. 617.

EUDO DE STELLA (ÉON, EUON DE L'ÉTOILE): Founder of a heretical sect in France; d. after 1148. He came from a noble family of Brittany and rose into prominence there about 1146 as a vehement opposer of the hierarchy and an exponent of apocalyptic views. He appears to have applied to himself the liturgical formula [Otto of Freising *De Gestis Friderici, I*, chap. 54]" by him (Lat. *eum*, which he connected with his own name *Éon*) who is to come to judge the quick and the dead," gave himself out to be the Son of God, and by prophecies and feigned miracles gathered some following. Though a layman and unable to read, he celebrated mass, elected " angels " and " apostles " from among his adherents, and bestowed on them high-sounding names like " Judgment " and " Wisdom," together with the rank of bishops and archbishops. They undertook devastating raids for the plunder of churches and cloisters, and spent their pillaged treasures, so the narrative runs, in riotous orgies. In 1148 Eudo was captured, with a number of his followers. When led for trial before the Synod of Reims, he vaingloriously appealed to his " divine mission." He died not long afterward in the prison of Archbishop Samson of Reims. Some of his adherents, who would seem to have spread as far as Languedoc, were burned at the stake. Hereafter the sect disappears from history. About the same period as Eudo's time certain heresies of a Manichean character were prevalent in Brittany, but it is an erroneous deduction from this fact to suppose that Eudo should be included among the Cathari. In reality he was a mystic fanatic, who went his own way. Herman Haupt.

Bibliography: C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, i. 463, Stuttgart, 1845; C. Schmidt, *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares*, i. 48, Paris, 1849; H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition*, i. 66, New York, 1906; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte*, i. 101, Munich, 1890; K. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 495, Freiburg, 1892; C. Molinier, in *Revue historique*, liv (1894), 158–161; P. Alphandéry, *Les Idées morales chez les hétérodoxes Latins au début du 13e. siècle*, pp. 102 sqq., Paris, 1904; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. 516–517; *KL*, iv. 662; Schaff, v, I, pp. 482, 483.

EUDOCIA, yu-dō'shi-a, ÆLIA: Empress of Byzantium and wife of Theodosius II. (408–450); b. at Athens 394; d. at Jerusalem c. 460. Her original name was Athenais, and she was the daughter of the pagan rhetorician Leontius, she herself attaining wide celebrity as a scholarly defender of the ancient faith. After the death of her father, she is said to have gone to Constantinople to protest to Pulcheria, the sister of the empress, against the provisions of the will of Leontius, but Pulcheria, charmed by her beauty and culture, converted her to Christianity and presented her to her brother as a bride. The marriage is dated in 421, and she bore Theodosius a daughter Eudoxia, who became the wife of the Western emperor Valentinian III. In 438 Eudocia went to Jerusalem and brought back relics which included the two chains of St. Peter, depositing one at Constantinople and presenting the other to her daughter at Rome, where it gave its name to the church of St. Peter ad Vincula. Two statues were erected at Antioch in gratitude for Eudocia's eulogy of the city. Before

444 she was again in Jerusalem, where she passed the remainder of her life, apparently in banishment. The cause of her disgrace is unknown, although Malalas ascribes it to an intrigue. It is at least certain, however, that in the commotion caused in Egypt and Palestine by the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon Eudocia took the side of the Palestinian monks against the government, her influence being so powerful that Pope Leo wrote her in 453, seeking to change her attitude; and after consulting with the famous Simon the Stylite and Euthymius, a monk of the Syrian desert, she accepted the decrees. In her closing years Eudocia wrote in hexameters a paraphrase of the Octateuch and the history of Cyprian and Justina. The latter work, portraying the life, conversion, and martyrdom of a Magian, is of interest as the oldest poetic form of the Faust-legend.

(C. Neumann.)

Bibliography: The fragments of her *Carmina* were edited by A. Ludwich, Leipsic, 1897. The chief source for a life are the *Chronicle* of John Malalas (best ed. by L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1831), though that source is romance rather than history, and Nicephorus Callistus, *Hist. eccl.*, xiv. 23. Consult: W Wiegand, *Eudoxia*, Worms, 1871; F. Gregorovius, *Athenais*, Leipsic, 1882; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, iii. 387–390.

EUDOXIUS OF GERMANICIA: Arian bishop of Constantinople, not improperly called the father of the Arianism which in the Arian churches so long outlasted the Arian controversy; b. at Arabissus (the modern Yarpuz, 50 m. n. of Marash), in Cappadocia, c. 300; d. 370. He was the son of a certain Cæsarius who because of his death as a martyr is considered a saint of the Roman Church. During his theological education Eudoxius imbibed the ideas of Lucian the Martyr (q.v.), probably at Antioch; for according to Athanasius (*Hist. Arianorum ad monachos*, iv., *MPG*, xxv. 700A, Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., iv. 271) he belonged to the followers of Arius in Antioch whom Bishop Eustathius refused to receive into the clergy between 325 and 330. After the overthrow of Eustathius (330) he became bishop of Germanicia (in Commagene, near the Cappadocian-Cilician-Syrian boundary). He took part in the Synod of Antioch in 341 as a partizan of the Eusebians; he also attended the synod of the Oriental clergy in Sardica in 343. He first became generally known in 344, when, as one of the envoys he brought the *Formula macrostichos* into the West—a mission for which his polite and obliging manners must have especially recommended him. He was one of the few Orientals who participated in the Synod of Milan in 355. In the following two years he seems to have remained, like Acacius (see Acacius of Cæsarea), at the court or in the company of the court bishops, since he took part in the negotiations at the court in Sirmium in 357 in which the second formula of Sirmium was composed.

About this time Bishop Leontius of Antioch died, and Eudoxius immediately returned to the East and took his place, apparently with the consent of Acacius, Ursacius, and Valens, not later than the beginning of 358. As bishop he accepted at a synod in Antioch the " Formula of Peace " of Sirmium, but soon showed that he intended to explain it in the Arian sense. According to Athanasius (*De synodis*, xxxviii., *MPG*, xxvi. 761A), Aëtius taught Eudoxius the " Arian impiety " about this time, and it is true that the Arianism of Eudoxius in former days was less radical and pronounced, but it is possible that Aëtius influenced him at an earlier time. The extreme Arian tendencies of Eudoxius called forth the opposition of the Homoiousians, and this party gained for a short time the upper hand. Emperor Constantius now disowned Eudoxius; apparently he was exiled and retired to his native country. He returned and took part in the Synod of Seleucia in 359. Later he went to Constantinople, under the protection of Acacius, but only after long negotiations and after his renunciation of the teachings of Aëtius was he able to regain the favor of the emperor. On Jan. 27, 360, he was enthroned as bishop of the capital. It is true, he broke with Eunomius and Aëtius, but the enmity between him and the Homoiousians remained and directed the course of his theology and church polity. In the time of Valens, this tendency regained the ascendency. The Synod of Lampsacus in 364 compelled the emperor to choose between the Homoiousians and the Homœans of the last two years of Constantius. Valens declared himself in favor of the Homœans, probably not without the influence of Eudoxius.

The most lasting result of the activity of Eudoxius was the Arianism of the Germans; for the Goths did not receive uncompromising Arianism, but that Homœan form of it which was sanctioned at the Synod of Constantinople in 360 and became court religion under Valens. To the council of 381 and the orthodox theologians of that time " Arians " and " Eudoxians " were synonymous conceptions. Eudoxius wrote a " Discourse on the Incarnation," which has perished; certain fragments, attributed to him, may point also to other writings.

(F Loofs.)

Bibliography: Scattered references appear in Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 19, 37, 40, 43, iv. 26; and Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 25. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. vi. passim; C. P. Caspari, *Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, pp. 176–185, Christiania, 1879; F. Reiche, *Chronologie der letzten sechs Bücher des Ammianus Marcellinus*, Jena, 1889; *DCB*, ii. 265–266; *KL*, iv. 960–962; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. i., Eng. transl., vol. ii.

EUGENIUS, yu-jî'ni-us: The name of four popes.

Eugenius I.: Pope 654–657. He was a Roman and was chosen pope in accordance with the command of the emperor and the exarch to select a successor to Martin I., who had been banished (see Martin I.; Monothelites). He was consecrated Aug. 10, 654. Eugenius had already been apocrisiarius in Constantinople and thus seemed to be fit to bring about a reconciliation with the imperial court in the Monothelite controversy. The apocrisiarii whom he sent to Constantinople concluded peace with Pyrrhus, the patriarch, and under the influence of Peter, the trusted friend of Pyrrhus, the dispute between the Monothelites and Dyothelites seemed to be approaching its end. When Peter was appointed patriarch of Constantinople in 655, he sent, according to custom, an official letter to Eugenius, announcing his election,

which contained no orthodox utterances on the "operations and wills" of Christ; therefore the monks of Rome, fearing the invasion of heterodoxy, protested, and clergy and people took their side. Eugenius was forced to promise to repel the approaches of Constantinople, and the hope of reconciliation was frustrated. He died June 2 or 3, 657. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 34, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 185; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste von Gregor I.*, i. 177–178, Elberfeld, 1868; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche bis Leo I.*, i. 356–359, Bonn, 1881; Mann, *Popes*, I., i. 406–412; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 238 sqq.; *DCB*, ii. 270; Bower, *Popes*, i. 457–458; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 281.

Eugenius II.: Pope 824–827. After the death of Paschalis I. the people of Rome chose as their candidate for the vacancy the deacon Laurentius. But the nobility finally gained the victory, and their choice, Eugenius, archpriest of Santa Sabina, was consecrated and enthroned as Eugenius II. June 6, 824. The emperor Louis acknowledged him, and sent his son Lothair to Rome to settle existing difficulties. The points settled between Lothair and the pope were, in the main, four: (1) the annulment of illegal confiscations which had taken place under the late popes; (2) regulation of the administration of justice and suppression of brigandage; (3) regulation of the relation of subjects to the Frankish empire; (4) regulation of papal elections. The political supremacy of the emperor over Rome was emphasized by Lothair in every respect. Each newly elected pope had to avow his faithfulness to the emperor before consecration. Nevertheless, Lothair considered the wishes of all parties, the people, the nobility, and the papal court, as far as possible and thus his mission had the desired success; peace and justice were secured for a number of years in Rome. But while the young Lothair tried to emphasize the Frankish supremacy, the old emperor yielded to the pope the general administration of ecclesiastical affairs. In the controversy concerning pictures in the church (824–826) which was initiated by Emperor Michael II. of Byzantium, the Frankish emperor conceded all authority to the pope. At a synod in Rome, in 826, it was manifest that the papacy had now seized the reins of church government. The pontificate of Eugenius II. makes, at least ecclesiastically, an important advance in the emancipation of the papacy from the Frankish empire. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 69, Paris, 1894; *Annales Einhardi*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH, Script.*, i (1826), 135–218; Theganus, *Vita Hludowici*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH, Script.*, ii (1829), 585–603; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 322 sqq.; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 331–339, Elberfeld, 1868; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche von Leo I.*, pp. 809–815, Bonn, 1885; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 444 sqq., 489; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 202–208.

Eugenius III.: Pope 1145–53. He was a Pisan by birth, Bernard by name, had studied under the great Bernard at Clairvaux, and was appointed by him abbot of the Cistercian monastery of St. Athanasius near Rome; he was also a cardinal. When Pope Lucius II. died suddenly, Feb. 15, 1145, in the midst of his struggle with the Roman Senate (see LUCIUS II.), the cardinals immediately elected Bernard his successor, and he was enthroned in the Lateran as Eugenius III., all on the same day. Two days later the senatorial party compelled him to leave the city. A sentence of excommunication pronounced by him against the patrician Pierleone had no effect, and Bernard of Clairvaux, who interceded for him, was unable to pacify the Romans; nor yet could the pope induce King Conrad III. of Germany to take arms against the insurgent Romans. Not until Christmas, was Eugenius able to reenter Rome, after concluding a treaty of peace with the senatorial party, wherein he recognized the Roman Republic under that party's authority. A few weeks later, however, he was compelled once again to forsake the Lateran.

Disorders in Rome.

At this time Eugenius succeeded in assuming the leadership in a matter which concerned all Western Christendom. In consequence of the conquest of Edessa by the Emir Zengi of Mosul (Christmas, 1144), the Christian seigniories in the East were gravely imperiled, while from Jerusalem itself there came urgent appeals for help; furthermore an Armenian embassy opened up some prospect of a submission of the Armenian Church to the Roman See. The interest of Eugenius III. in behalf of the East was so strongly aroused that on Dec. 1, 1145, he issued the encyclical *Quantum prædecessores* summoning the king, the nobility and the people of France to take up the cross, and assuring them of ecclesiastical rewards the same as on the First Crusade. This appeal had a brilliant sequel. Louis VII. of France, who had long projected a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, was promptly ready; and even Conrad III. of Germany promised, at the Imperial Diet of Speyer, Dec. 27, 1146, to support the cross. That the appeal resulted so effectually was really due to Bernard of Clairvaux (q.v.). But the pope profited by it, as is manifest above all in connection with the synod convened at Reims on Mar. 21, 1148, and attended by more than four hundred bishops. Among the notable measures then passed (the acts are not preserved) is the declaration of the invalidity of consecration by Anacletus II., and of marriages contracted by priests; as well as the imposition of the interdict upon the residence of an excommunicated person. Eugenius felt his position to be so strengthened that he ventured to suspend the archbishops of Cologne and Mainz, and came near excommunicating King Stephen of England; envoys of King Henry of Germany requested of him a brief to the German clerics exhorting them to stand loyally by his side in his father's absence. While this synod was yet in session the pope received news of the discomfiture of the German and French crusaders; whereupon he hastily returned to Italy.

The Second Crusade.

Not very favorable conditions awaited him here. Arnold of Brescia (q.v.), who had been received again into the communion of the Church by Eugenius at the beginning of his pontificate, had remained quiet at first; but during the Pope's long absence from Rome, he had resumed his reformatory efforts. By his espousal of magnificent plans

for the Eternal City, he had so fascinated the Roman people that a treaty was concluded according to which Arnold pledged himself under oath to defend the Roman Republic, and the people on their side promised to support him. All the attempts of Eugenius to break this bond between Arnold and the Romans were ineffectual. Nor did he succeed, at the close of 1149 and with the aid of King Roger of Sicily, in subduing the Roman Republic by force of arms.

Arnold of Brescia.

This alliance with the Norman king also exercised an unfavorable influence upon his relations with Conrad of Germany, who, on his side, aroused the pope's suspicion by reason of a compact with the Greek Emperor Manuel. The antipapal party in Rome sought to utilize this tension between Eugenius and Conrad for their own ends, and endeavored to draw the latter over to their side, though without success. When the pope through a treaty with the Roman Senate was able to return to Rome, the relations between pope and king assumed a more favorable turn, since Eugenius supported Conrad in restitution of Duke Wladislav of Poland, his half-sister's husband. However, new tensions arose not long afterward. In France there was an active desire for a new crusade to restore the shattered Christian rule in the East; and because the miscarriage of the last crusade was charged against the Greek Empire, the enterprise was to be directed against this power. But this plan was to be executed only in case Roger of Sicily fought on the side of France; and since this contingency in turn presupposed the neutrality of the German king, the undertaking of the crusade depended upon the problematical success of achieving a reconciliation between Roger and Conrad. The attempt miscarried; and at this juncture Eugenius made a total change of policy, withdrawing his support from the crusading project, and contriving to restore favorable relations with the German king. Their mutual interests drew them still closer together. The pope, unable to master the continually recurring tumults in Rome and again forced to leave the city, desired the king's intervention; and Conrad aspired to the Imperial crown: hence he formed the plan of a march to Rome, which was formally approved by the magnates of the Empire at the Imperial Diet of Würzburg, Sept. 15, 1151, and the preparations were begun; but before the appointed term, Conrad died at Bamberg, Feb. 15, 1152. His successor, Frederick I., Barbarossa, adopted the plan, and the German princes, at a new Imperial Diet at Würzburg (Oct. 13, 1152), swore to support the Roman expedition.

Relations with Germany and France.

Before it was actually started, however, Eugenius came to such terms with the Romans that he could return to Rome, this time cordially received by Senate and people. There he concluded with the envoys of the German king a treaty which proved highly important in the statecraft of the following years; it was ratified by Frederick at Constance, Mar. 23, 1153. The king promised to conclude peace neither with the Romans nor with Roger of Sicily without the approbation of Eugenius or his successors; to subject, so far as he could, the Romans to the pope as they had been subject to him a century past; to defend against every assailant the honor and the regalia of St. Peter as guardian steward of the Roman Church. The pope promised to honor the king as son of St. Peter, to crown him emperor, and to proceed against foes of the Empire with canonical penalties. They promised reciprocally to cede no domain in Italy to the Greek emperor, and if he made an incursion there, to drive him out.

Treaty between Eugenius and Frederick I.

Eugenius died near Tibur July 8, 1153, and was buried in St. Peter's at Rome. His conduct as politician was not without address, and the apprehensions of Bernard of Clairvaux, who dedicated to him the famous tract *De consideratione*, were not realized. He surrendered naught of the papal authority, and understood how to uphold it. In his manner of life and in his sympathies he constantly showed that he was an old Cistercian. That he failed to master the Roman revolutionary movement is not an evidence of incapacity. It was good fortune for him that he died before the great conflict broke out between Frederick I. and the Papacy.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ* and *Privilegia* of Eugenius III. are in *MPL*, cvi., clxxx., clxxxii. Consult: J. Delannes, *Hist. du pontificat d'Eugène III.*, Nantes, 1737; Jaffé, *Regesta*, ii. 20–89; G. Sainate, *Vita del Eugenio III.*, Pisa, 1868; M. Jocham, *Geschichte des Lebens . . des Papstes Eugenius III.*, Augsburg, 1873; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, IV., ii. 56–64, London, 1896; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche von Gregor VIII.*, Bonn, 1893; J. Jastrow and G. Winter, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Hohenstaufen*, vol. i., Stuttgart, 1897; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 477–485; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv. 244–262.

Eugenius IV. (Gabriello Condulmieri): Pope 1431–47. He came from a Venetian mercantile family and belonged to the Celestine Order. Although he was still young and none too well equipped for the position, he was chosen to succeed Martin V on Mar. 3, 1431. The history of his papacy is largely that of the Council of Basel, and his importance is in the fact that to him more than to any one else was due the failure of the council and the whole idea of reform by councils. He summoned the council Mar. 12, 1431, but soon repented, for he realized that it might bring great danger to himself. The distrust between pope and council grew steadily on both sides, and culminated in a bull of the former dissolving the council and action by the latter deposing the pope and the choice of Felix V. (q.v.) as his successor (see BASEL, COUNCIL OF). An event favorable to Eugenius was the union consummated (on paper) in 1439 between the Roman and Greek Churches, whereby his reputation in the West was considerably augmented (see FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF). He also lived to see Germany, which at first had declared itself neutral between pope and council, range itself on his side. In France he could not annul the so-called Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges of 1438 (see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, III., 2), but he succeeded in keeping this

important land faithful to his obedience. He died Feb. 23, 1447. His successors praised him for having saved the power of the papacy in difficult times; and by his victory over the council and by the union with the Greeks he did really contribute to the restoration of Ultramontane ideas of the papacy after they had been shaken by the Great Western Schism. PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita* is in Muratori, *Scriptores*, III., ii. 868–878. Consult: A. Masius, *Ueber die Stellung des Kamaldulensers A. Traversari zum Papst Eugen IV.*, Döbling, 1886; M. Birck, *Der Kölner Erzbischof Dietrich . und Papst Eugen IV.*, Bonn, 1889; Creighton, *Papacy*, ii. 165–373; Pastor, *Popes*, i. 282–361; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii. 538–viii. 98; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 218–234; *KL*, iv. 970 sqq.

EUGIPIUS, yu-jip'i-us (**EUGIPPIUS, EUGEPIUS, EUGYPPIUS, EGIPPIUS**): Monk and ecclesiastical writer; b. in Noricum about 455 or 460; d. between 533 and 543. His life is obscure and the alleged facts given by various writers are to be rejected. Under his name there have been preserved an extract (*Thesaurus*) from a part of the works of Augustine which circulated in numerous manuscripts during the Middle Ages and was greatly esteemed; some letters, and a biography of St. Severin (q.v.). The latter is his most important work. It is written in a simple style, bare of almost every ornament, and it is this simplicity and naïveté which have procured universal recognition for the work. Historians have special reason to esteem this biography, as they obtain from an eye-witness important information concerning a period and part of the Roman empire which otherwise would be unknown. The time is that after Attila's last invasion of Italy and after his death, when Germanic tribes such as the Goths entered Italy, robbing and spoiling, murdering, and taking captives. Only certain fortresses on the right bank of the Danube resisted for some time the attacks of the Germans, especially through the aid of Severin, who warned the Romans of the threatened invasion and gained also the respect of the Arian Germans and induced them to retire. But the downfall of the Roman dominion in Noricum could not long be postponed. Shortly after the death of Severin (482) the time came which had been predicted by him when the last Romans emigrated from Noricum and returned to Italy. In 487 they carried his bones with them, thus fulfilling his last wish. The remains were finally deposited in 491 or 492 at Lucullanum, on a small island in the Bay of Naples, where a noble woman provided a beautiful burying-place. There a new monastery was erected for Severin's disciples, of which Eugipius became the third abbot.

During the latter years of the life of Severin, Eugipius was one of his disciples. He witnessed his last deeds and heard his last admonitions and predictions. He wrote his biography of the saint in the beginning of the sixth century. A distinguished layman, the author of a biography of a monk named Bassus, had asked Eugipius for material on the life of Severin, with the intention of using it as the basis for another biography. Eugipius complied with the wish, and wrote down all his own recollections and those of his older brethren, arranging them chronologically. Then he hesitated to entrust a layman with his material and finally gave it to Paschasius, a deacon, asking him to write a biography of Severin and give an account of his miracles and predictions. Paschasius, however, refused, on the ground that no scholarly skill could add to the memorial of Eugipius. A stranger, he thought, might only spoil the representation of the pupil and eye-witness. Thus there were no changes made in the manuscript. Eugipius was not learned, especially in secular sciences. His judgment in theological matters is not deep, and he relates miracle after miracle, without the least attempt to explain them.
(K. LEIMBACH†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Opera*, ed. J. Herold, appeared Basel, 1542; in *MPL*, lxii.; and in *CSEL*, ix. parts 1–2. Consult: M. Büdinger, in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, xci (1878), 793–814; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, 5th ed., i. 47, 6th ed., i. 44–49, ii. 501; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Literatur*, i. 431 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, p. 1286, § 494, no. 3, Leipsic, 1890; *DCB*, ii. 275–276.

EUHEMERUS, yū-hî'mer-us (**EUEMERUS**): Greek philosopher; flourished about 316–300 B.C. He was possibly a native of Messene, though Agrigentum, Tegea in Arcadia, and the island of Cos all claimed him. In philosophy he was allied to the school of Aristippus of Cyrene. He lived at the court of Cassander of Macedon, by whom he was sent on a journey into the region of the Indian Ocean. On his return he wrote a "Sacred History," the method of which made him famous. In this work he claimed to have found in Panaræa, the capital of the (fabulous) island Panchæa, a temple to Zeus where was a column bearing the register of the births and deaths of many of the gods. He professed to take this as a clue and interpreted myth as history, regarding the gods as eminent men posthumously deified, thus anticipating the Spencerian school and giving his name to that type of interpretation of history and myth called Euhemerism. The book was attractive in style and matter, and was translated by the Latin poet Ennius (Cicero, *De natura deorum*, i. 42). Only a few fragments remain, collected in Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliothecæ historicæ*, ed. P. Wesseling (Amsterdam, 1746), in I. P. Cory, *Ancient Fragments* (London, 1876), and G. N. Remethy (Budapest, 1889). The work was a subtle attack on paganism, and its method was taken up by the Christian Apologists (cf. Lactantius, "Institutes," i. 11, Eng. transl. *ANF*, vii. 20–24—founded on Euhemerus), and continued to be in favor until very recent times. GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gauss, *Quæstiones Euhemereæ*, Kemper, 1860; R. de Block, *Euhémère; son livre et sa doctrine*, Mons, 1876; valuable notes are to be found in *Mémoires de l'academie des inscriptions*, vols. viii., p. xv., xxxiv. 453, 462. xxv. 1.

EULALIUS, yu-lê'lî-us: Antipope 418–419. For his election and expulsion, see BONIFACE I. He was banished to Campania, where he remained quiet during the pontificate of his successful opponent, after whose death some were found to support again the choice of Eulalius. He died the year after Boniface, in 423. (A. HAUCK.)

Bibliography: Bower, *Popes*, i. 162–167; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 198–199. See also the literature under Boniface I.

EULOGIA, yu-lō'ji-ɑ: A word used several times in the New Testament, with the general sense of "blessing." In patristic and ecclesiastical writers it has a double meaning. The earlier was that of a definite clerical blessing, which, according to the Apostolic Constitutions, the deacon was not to impart, while the presbyter received it at his ordination only from the bishop, and the latter only from other bishops; it was imparted to the laity in the Eucharist and on other solemn occasions by the bishop or presbyter. The word was applied also to the special blessing given to catechumens or *competentes*, and to the hallowing of liturgical materials, such as water and oil; in the later ritual books it occurs of the marriage blessing, the setting apart of monks, etc.

The second and better-known use of the word was in a sacramental connection. The use of it in I Cor. x. 16 was compared with that of *eucharistēsas* and *eulogēsas* in Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, which were taken as equivalent; and *eulogia* was employed for the Eucharist itself. In the third century *eulogein* was used for the act of consecration and administration of the elements (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 43), and numerous passages in Cyril of Alexandria show that in his time *eulogia* meant either the Lord's Supper itself or the consecrated bread. But this meaning underwent various modifications. As early as Irenæus it was customary for bishops to send the sacrament to other places in token of unity. The Council of Laodicea forbids this practise (can. xiv.) on the ground of possible profanation. In the fifth century *eulogiæ* were given even to catechumens and penitents, who were debarred from the reception of the sacrament; but later liturgical writers explain these as portions of the bread offered at the Eucharist but not consecrated, only blessed and given as a sort of substitute for the sacrament to these classes. This "blessed bread" is what is called *antidōron* in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom; its connection with the term under consideration is explained by the formula of administration found there which begins with the words "the *eulogia* of God." This use of the word was handed down to the modern Greek Church, and the custom persisted in the West (Conc. Nannetense, can. ix. 890, where the priest is to keep such pieces of bread previously blessed to distribute after the mass to those who have not been prepared for communion).

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, XV., iv. 3, 8, XVI., vi. 3; C. Cracau, *Die Liturgie des heiligen Chrysostomus*, pp. 135–136, Gütersloh, 1890; Von Drews, in *Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie*, xx (1898), 18–19; and the lexicons.

EULOGIUS, OF ALEXANDRIA: Patriarch of Alexandria 580–607, succeeding John IV He was originally presbyter and abbot of the monastery of Mary in Antioch, and combated the Monophysite heresy in numerous works, of which a number were read by Photius (*Bibliotheca*, codex ccxxvi.). O. Bardenhewer has edited, in Greek and German, excerpts preserved from his work "On the Trinity" (*TQ*, lxxviii., 1896, pp. 354–401). A sermon on Palm Sunday (Matt. xxi.) and fragments of other works were collected by Mai (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 2, pp. 2907–64). Eulogius is revered as a saint by the Greeks on Feb. 13 and by the Latins on Sept. 13.

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: J. M. Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, ii. 46–52, London, 1847; A. von Gutschmid, in *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 469–470, Leipsic, 1890; *DCB*, ii. 283.

EULOGIUS OF CORDOVA: Spanish martyr; b. at Cordova after 800; beheaded there Mar. 11, 859. He was of good family, was educated for the priesthood, became deacon and presbyter of the Church of St. Zoilus at Cordova, and adopted a life of the strictest asceticism. His grandfather had been noted for hatred of the Mohammedans, and Eulogius's inherited tendencies were strengthened by his teacher, the abbot Speraindeo of Cordova, and by his intimate friend Alvar (q.v.). Returning home from a visit to Northern Spain undertaken in 848, he found a party among the Christians characterized by a fanatical desire for martyrdom, which they sought by publicly reviling Mohammed. Influenced by Alvar, after some hesitation Eulogius came forward as the apologist of this party, and wrote in glorification of martyrs and exhorting to emulate them. The emir Abdalrahman II. (822–852), whose policy was tolerant and enlightened, with the support of some of the Christians headed by an archbishop Reccafred (probably of Seville), sought in vain to check the fanatical movement (see Cordova). Eulogius was imprisoned for a time, but his literary activity was not interfered with. He was chosen successor to Archbishop Wistremir of Toledo (d. 858), but the emir refused to confirm his election; disappointed and filled with new fanaticism, he sought the death which he had praised in others. Alvar glorified him in hymns and in an account of his life and death (in *MPL*, cxv. 705–720). His works include a few letters and a *Memoriale sanctorum martyrum* in three books, which is the main source of the martyr history of the time and appears to be a sober and trustworthy narrative of facts; and a *Liber apologeticus sanctorum martyrum*, in which he tries to place the Spanish martyrs on a level with those of the early Church and the Mohammedans with the Roman persecutors. With his other works, scholia, etc., they are in *MPL*, cxv. 731–912.

Bibliography: *ASB*, Mar., i. 88–97; W. von Baudissin, *Eulogius und Alvar*, Leipsic, 1872; R. Dozy, *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne*, ii. 1–174, Leyden, 1861; P. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, ii. 299–338, Regensburg, 1874.

EUNOMIUS, yu-nō'mî-us, **EUNOMIANS:** A heretic of the fourth century and his party. Eunomius was born at Oltiseris, in the district of Korniaspa, in Cappadocia, close to the Galatian boundary (Gregory of Nyssa in *MPG*, xlv. 281D; cf. W M. Ramsay, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, London, 1890, p. 264 and map p. 197); d. at Dakora in the district of Cæsarea (Sozomen, VII., xvii. 1; Ramsay, ut sup., 306–307) c. 393. His father seems to have been a man of education, who took care to give his son the same advantages. There is, however, no very definite information as to his life until 356 or 357, when he came to Aëtius

in Alexandria, recommended, according to Philostorgius, by the Arian teacher Secundus, who was then in Antioch, whose secretary he had been. He gained the favor of Eudoxius, bishop of Antioch (see EUDOXIUS OF GERMANICIA), who made him a deacon. When Eudoxius was suspended but not yet banished, Eunomius was sent to the emperor in his behalf, but was taken prisoner by the Homoiousians on the road and banished to Midæa in Phrygia in the autumn of 358. After the Synod of Seleucia, with Aëtius, he followed the semi-Arian bishops to Constantinople, and took a prominent part in the theological disputations there which ended in the defeat of the semi-Arians.

Bishop of Cyzicus.

Early in 360 Eunomius was made bishop of Cyzicus by Eudoxius, accepting the office, it would seem, partly in the hope of facilitating the recall of his old teacher Aëtius, while Eudoxius may have hoped to win Eunomius for his conciliatory type of Arianism. Complications followed, but they are hard to trace in detail. According to Theodoret, whose account is followed by Tillemont and Klose as well as by most modern scholars, the people of Cyzicus succeeded in inducing Eunomius to emerge from his doctrinal reticence and declare himself; they then accused him before Eudoxius, who, after long hesitation, deposed Eunomius from his bishopric, and thus determined him to found a party of his own—at first in Pamphylia, whither he retired. Philostorgius knows of the accusation of the Cyzicenes, but asserts that Eunomius was wholly cleared; that nevertheless, being unwilling to assent either to the condemnation of Aëtius or to the decrees of Rimini, he voluntarily resigned his bishopric and retired to his birthplace; that Acacius then calumniated him before Constantius, with the result that he was cited to appear at the synodal negotiations at Antioch in the winter of 360–361; that Acacius did not press his charges, and the matter was thus postponed to a larger synod, the convocation of which was prevented by the emperor's death. On the whole the latter account seems preferable in that the probably independent narrative of Sozomen is more easily reconcilable with it than with Theodoret's.

Breach with the Semi-Arians.

Under Julian the Anomœan party was able once more to raise its head. Eunomius went to Constantinople, and there, in concert with Aëtius, attempted to establish an Anomœan church. Eudoxius of Antioch and even Eudoxius, now bishop of Constantinople, seemed, now that court influence was no longer to be considered, not indisposed to join the more radical Arians; but under Julian's successors they perceived the danger of such sympathies and drew back. Eunomius and his friends were thus driven to the formation of an independent ecclesiastical organization. They consecrated bishops for Lydia, Ionia, Palestine, and Constantinople. From this time (about the end of 363) dates the definitive breach between the conciliatory Arians (Homœans) and the Anomœans. Eudoxius seized with avidity the occasion offered by these proceedings and refused to acknowledge the consecrations, strengthened in his policy by the favor which Valens showed him in the first period of his residence at Constantinople; and Euzoius recognized the logic of events. Aëtius and Eunomius left the representation of their cause in the capital to Florentius, and retired, the former to the neighborhood of Mytilene, the latter to Chalcedon. Here they lived for a while without exercising ecclesiastical functions. On the proclamation as emperor of Procopius, Eunomius, with whom he had previously had friendly relations, returned to Constantinople with Aëtius before the downfall of Procopius (May 27, 366), and remained there after the death of Aëtius, which can not have occurred before the next spring. In the winter of 367 Eunomius was banished to Mauretania on account of his relations with the usurper; but influence was brought to bear upon Valens, which resulted in his recall in the autumn of 369.

His Later Life.

After this he lived apparently at Chalcedon; but little is known of the last years of his life. Socrates relates that when Theodosius called a conference of the leaders of various religious parties in Constantinople (June, 383) Eunomius represented his associates there. But his cause was hopeless. Immediately before the accession of Theodosius, Gratian had expressly excluded the Eunomians, with the Photinians and Manicheans, from the toleration which he proclaimed. The edict of Theodosius on Feb. 27, 380, had indirectly proscribed them, and that of Jan. 10, 381, directly. On July 25, 383, after the conference mentioned above, the emperor issued a similar edict against a wider range of heresies. Eunomius, the only leader to incur personal punishment, was banished once more. He resided for a time at Chalcedon, still exercising a certain influence in Constantinople, was then sent to Halmyris in Mœsia, and when this place was taken by the barbarian invaders, to Cæsarea in Cappadocia. He was finally allowed to retire to his estate at Dakora.

His party did not long survive him. Imperial edicts ordered the banishment of their leaders and the burning of their books, and denied them the right of testamentary disposition. And divisions occurred within their own ranks, apparently connected with baptismal customs. The Eunomians did not recognize the baptism or ordination even of the Arians, and substituted single for trine immersion.

Works.

The importance of Eunomius may be measured by the number of antagonists he found on the orthodox side, including Apollinaris, Didymus, Andronicianus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Sophronius, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa. Of his own works only five are known—besides a lost commentary on the Romans and collection of letters, a small apologetic book (the one controverted by Basil, Apollinaris, and Didymus), written probably soon after 360; a rejoinder to Basil, written just before the latter's death; and an "Exposition of the Faith," probably taken from the last-named to some extent, about 383. Epiphanius says that Eunomius and his followers went more widely astray than Arius; but this is a mistake. Arius was an Anomœan; and the *agen-*

nēsia [denial of the generation of the Son and insistence on his creaturehood] which was the essential mark of the Eunomian doctrine of God was taught also by Arius in the same way. The thought of Eunomius is clearer and supported by closer metaphysical and epistemological reasoning; but this involves no essential variance. (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: Sources of information are: Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 7, 13, v. 10, 24; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 26, 27, vii. 6, 17 (both in Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. ii.); Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 29; Gregory of Nyssa, "Against Eunomius" (in *NPNF*, 2 ser., v. 33–313). Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vi. 501–516; C. H. G. Rettberg, *Marcelliana*, Göttingen, 1794; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix. 207–214, Hamburg, 1804; C. R. W Klose, *Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius*, Kiel, 1833; F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, i. 347–352, Leipsic, 1894; F. Diekamp, *Die Gotteslehre des Gregor von Nyssa*, Münster, 1896; A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, pp. 148, 260–261, Breslau, 1897; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 444–452 et passim; Harnack, *Dogma*, iii.-iv.; *DCB*, ii. 286–290; literature under Arianism.

EUPHEMITES. See Messalians.

EUPHRATES, yu-frē'tîz: The greatest river of western Asia, mentioned in Gen. i. 14 as one of the four rivers of Eden. Thereafter it finds frequent mention, either by name or by epithet, in the Old Testament. It is sometimes called simply "the river" (Gen. xxxi. 21), and even "river," without the article (Isa. vii. 20, Heb. text).

The Euphrates is formed by the union of two small streams at about lat. 39° n. and long. 39° e. in the Armenian Mountains. The larger of these two streams, the Kara Su or western Euphrates, rises on the Domli Dagh, northeast of Erzerum. The other, the Murad Su or Eastern Euphrates, a charming mountain stream, rises on the Ala Dagh, not far from Lake Van. At their junction above Keben Maden they form a noble river 120 yards wide. At no point in its long course is the river finer than here. From this point the river flows south for a short distance, and then bends in a great westerly course around the Musher Dagh, and pierces the Taurus range with many sharp bends. At this part of its course the Euphrates seems destined to discharge its waters into the Mediterranean at the Gulf of Alexandretta, but the way is blocked by the Amanus and the Lebanon, and the river assumes a southeasterly course which is maintained to the Persian Gulf. It is this lower course which is the historic river, known to all the great peoples of Western Asia.

Its Course.

The tributaries of the Euphrates, after the union of the Kara Su and the Murad Su are few. The most important are the Sajur (Assyrian *Sangura* or *Sagura*) which enters from the west about lat. 36° 40′; the Belik (Assyrian *Balikhu*), from the east and north in long. 39° 9′; and, most important of all, the Khabur (Assyrian *Haburu*) entering from the northeast in lat. 35° 7′, long. 40° 30′ From the Khabur to its mouth, a distance of 800 miles, the Euphrates receives no tributary, and in the lower part of its course shows a marked tendency to split up into different channels. When it receives the Khabur it is 400 yards wide and eighteen feet deep. From that point it begins to diminish in volume. At Irzah or Werdi, seventy-five miles lower down, it is 350 yards wide and of the same depth; at Hadiseh, 140 miles below Werdi, it is 300 yards wide and of the same depth; at Hit, fifty miles below Hadiseh, its width has increased to 350 yards, but its depth has been diminished to sixteen feet; at Felujiah, seventy-five miles from Hit, the depth is twenty feet, but the width has diminished to 250 yards. From this point the contraction is rapid and striking. The Saklowijch Canal is given out upon the left, and some way farther down the Hindiyeh branches off upon the right, each carrying, when the Euphrates is full, a large body of water. The conscquence is that at Hillah, ninety miles below Felujiah, the stream is no more than 200 yards wide and fifteen feet deep; and at Lamlun, eighty-five miles lower down, it is reduced to 120 yards wide with a depth of no more than twelve feet. Some of the channels which take water out of the river afterward return to it again, but it never again attains its earlier greatness. The channel from Kurnah to El Khitr was found by Colonel Chesney to have "an average width of only 200 yards, and a depth of about eighteen or nineteen feet, which implies a body of water far inferior to that carried between the junction of the Khabur and Hit."

Tributaries and Size.

The Euphrates, and also the Tigris, has a flood season exactly as the Nile has. This fact is perfectly clear and indisputable, though Herodotus directly asserts the contrary. The inundation is indeed not so great as that of the Nile, but it is regular and extensive. The river begins to swell very slowly about the beginning of March, and gradually increases until the highest point is reached about the end of May, when the waters stand about thirteen feet above low water. At this point the river remains for about a month, sinks slightly toward the middle of July, and then more rapidly till September. At the junction of the Khabur the river is described as "spreading over the surrounding country like a sea." The slow and regular rise of the river made it exceedingly valuable for irrigation, of which the Babylonian people fully availed themselves. Along the banks were constructed brick walls provided with breakwaters to divert and control the swift current at its rise. Sluice gates controlled the rise so that the eastern bank received an inundation equal to the west, while canals almost innumerable diverted the retreating waters, and prevented the overflow from damaging the cultivable area. Furthermore, the water was retained in sufficient quantity to supply an irrigation system, far back from the river, after the fall of the river. This entire system is now a vast ruin. The river rises and falls as it wills, and sweeping far over the western bank, turns the country into a desolate morass. The harm of this is both positive and negative. It makes impossible any such great ingathering of grain as was usual when this great valley was the world's granary, and it fills the land with a dangerous miasma.

Inundation.

The Euphrates and the Tigris originally reached the Persian Gulf by separate estuaries, but they now unite and form the Shatt-al-Arab. It is be-

lieved that the Persian Gulf once extended 150 or perhaps even 200 miles farther north than at present, and the formation of alluvial land continues at the rate of about a mile in seventy years.

The whole course of the river is about 1,780 miles, and it is navigable for small vessels for about 1,200 miles. It has been well said that the " upper region of the Euphrates resembles that of the Rhine, while its middle course may be compared with that of the Danube, and its lower with the Nile." See ASSYRIA, II., § 2; BABYLONIA, II., §§ 1–2.

ROBERT W ROGERS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. R. Chesney, *Expedition for the Survey of the . Euphrates*, London, 1850 (the best); W. K. Loftus, *Chaldæa and Susiana*, ib. 1857; A. H. Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, chaps. xxi.–xxii., ib. 1867; G. Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, Essay ix., London, 1875; F. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* pp. 169–170, Leipsic, 1881; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 26–28, 122, 148, 239, 359, 528; *DB*, i. 794; *EB*, ii. 1427–29.

EUSEBIUS, yu-sê'bî-us: Pope 309. His pontificate lasted only from Apr. 18 to Aug. 17, after which, in consequence of disturbances within the Church which led to acts of violence, he was banished by the tyrant Maxentius, who had been the sole ruler of Rome since Apr., 308, and had at first shown himself friendly to the Christians. The difficulty arose, as in the case of his predecessor Marcellus, out of his attitude toward the Lapsed (q.v.), which represented the milder standpoint. He died in exile in Sicily, and was buried in the cemetery of Calixtus, his successor Damasus placing an epitaph of eight hexameters over his tomb; the epithet " martyr " contained in them is not to be taken in the strict sense. (EDGAR HENNECKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 167, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 45; *ASB*, Sept., vii. 265–271; F. X. Kraus, *Roma sotterranea*, pp. 181 sqq., Freiburg, 1879; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, I., i. 297–299, London, 1890; Bower, *Popes*, i. 41; *KL*, iv. 997–999.

EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA: An author to whom are attributed certain extant homilies which enjoyed some renown in the Eastern Church in the sixth and seventh centuries. Their homiletical merit does not rise above mediocrity, and nothing is known of the author. At all events, he was not a patriarch of Alexandria, as is affirmed in an early biography (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 1, pp. 297–310), written by one Johannes, a notary, and stating that Eusebius was called by Cyril to be his successor in the episcopate. The discourses belong probably to the fifth or sixth century, and possibly originated in Alexandria. They deal with the life of the Lord and with questions of ecclesiastical life and practise, which they resolve in a monastic-ascetic way. Their literary character is not quite clear; while most of them are adapted for public delivery, not a few bear the character of ecclesiastical pronouncements. They are printed in *MPG*, lxxxvi. 1, pp. 287–462, 509–536, except four included among Chrysostom's works. The fragments preserved in the so-called *Sacra parallela* are to be found in K. Holl's *Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter* (*TU*, new series, v. 2, Leipsic, 1899), pp. 314–332. A homily concerning the observance of Sunday is attributed by Zahn (see below) to Eusebius of Emesa.

G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. C. Thilo, *Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emesa*, Halle, 1832; T. Zahn, in *ZKW*. v (1884), 516–534; G. Morin, *Sermo de dominicae observatione, Une ancienne adaptation latine d'un sermon attribué à Eusèbe d'Alexandrie*, in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1907, pp. 530 sqq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 383–384; *DCB*, ii. 305–307.

EUSEBIUS (BRUNO) OF ANGERS: Bishop of Angers; d. Sept. 1, 1081. He is first met with as bishop of Angers at the synod of Reims in 1049, and for a long time had been an adherent of Berengar's doctrine of the Lord's Supper (see BERENGAR OF TOURS). As such he was regarded by Berengar himself and by his opponents Dietwin of Liége, Durand of Troarne, and Humbert. But when he recognized the strength of the opposition, he favored a compromise; at any rate he advised Berengar in 1054 to swear to the formula presented to him. Nevertheless Berengar considered him his friend many years later and requested him to silence a certain Galfrid Martini or to arrange a disputation. In his reply Eusebius not only regretted the whole controversy, but also stated that he would abide by the words of Holy Scripture, according to which the bread and wine after the consecration become the body and blood of the Lord; if one asks how this can take place the answer must be that it is not according to the order of nature but in accordance with the divine omnipotence; at any rate one must be careful not to give offense to the plain Christian. The epistle is a downright renunciation of Berengar in case he should still maintain his view. In favor of the supposition that Eusebius changed his opinion from deference to the count of Anjou, the decided opponent of Berengar and his doctrine, it can be adduced that he did not defend Berengar against the hostilities of the court, and that for a long time he sided with this violent prince. It is also possible that the fact impressed itself upon Eusebius that the religious consciousness of the time more and more opposed Berengar. Our knowledge, however, is too fragmentary to pass a very accurate sentence.

S. M. DEUTSCH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. E. Lessing, *Berengarius Turonensis* (*Werke*, ed. Lachmann-Maltzahn, viii. 331 sqq., 12 vols., Leipsic, 1853–57); H. Sudendorf, *Berengarius Turonensis*, pp. 92 sqq. et passim, Gotha, 1850; L. Schwabe, *Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Abendmahlsstreits*, Leipsic, 1887; J. Schnitzer, *Berengar von Tours*, 75 sqq., Munich, 1890; idem, in *Der Katholik*, 1892, 544 sqq.; Bröcking, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, v (1891), 362, vi (1892), 232; *ZKG*, xii (1891), 169; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 508–517.

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA.

I. Life.
Becomes Prominent in the Arian Controversy (§ 1).
II. Works.
Works on Biblical Text Criticism (§ 1).
The " Chronicle " (§ 2).
The " Church History " (§ 3).
Minor Historical Works (§ 4).
Apologetic and Dogmatic Works (§ 5).
Exegetical and Miscellaneous Works (§ 6).
III. Estimate of Eusebius.
His Doctrine (§ 1).
His Excellencies and Limitations (§ 2).

Eusebius of Cæsarea (often called *Eusebius Pamphili*, "Eusebius [the friend of] Pamphilus "; see PAMPHILUS). bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, the father of church history, was born about 275 or

280, place unknown; d. at Cæsarea (?), at the latest 340, most probably May 30, 339.

I. Life: Little is known of his youth. He became acquainted with the presbyter Dorotheus in Antioch and probably received exegetical instruction from him. In 296 he was in Palestine and saw Constantine who visited the country with Diocletian. He was in Cæsarea when Agapius was bishop and made the acquaintance of Pamphilus, who became his intimate friend. With him he pursued studies which seem to have related chiefly to the preparation of a correct text of the Bible, with the aid of Origen's Hexapla, and commentaries collected by Pamphilus. In 307 Pamphilus was thrown into prison, but Eusebius continued his intercourse and studies. The fruit of their common labors was an apology for Origen in which Pamphilus and Eusebius collaborated, which was finished by Eusebius after the death of Pamphilus and sent to the martyrs in the mines of Phæno in Egypt (see below, II., § 5). After the death of Pamphilus, Eusebius seems to have gone to Tyre and later to Egypt, where apparently he first suffered persecution. The charge that he purchased his liberty by sacrificing to the gods is unfounded.

Eusebius is next heard of as bishop of Cæsarea. He succeeded Agapius, whose time of office is not known, but Eusebius must have become bishop soon after 313. Nothing is known about the first years of his official activity, but with the beginning of the Arian controversies he becomes prominent. Arius appealed to him as his protector, and from a letter of Eusebius to Alexander it is evident that he aided the exiled presbyter (see Arius). When the Council of Nicæa met in 325, Eusebius was prominent in its transactions. He was not naturally a leader or a deep thinker,

1. Becomes Prominent in the Arian Controversy.

but as a very learned man and well trained in history, at the same time a famous author who enjoyed the special favor of the emperor, he came to the front among the 300 members of the council. The confession which he proposed became the basis of the Nicene formula (see Nicæa, Council of). Eusebius was variously implicated in the further development of the Arian controversies, as, for instance, in the dispute with Eustathius of Antioch (q.v.). Eustathius combated the continually growing influence of Origen and his allegorizing exegesis, seeing in his theology the roots of Arianism. Eusebius, on the other hand, was an admirer of Origen, and employed the same principles in his exegesis. Eustathius reproached Eusebius for deviating from the Nicene faith, and was charged in turn with Sabellianism. Eustathius was accused, condemned and deposed at a synod in Antioch. The people of Antioch, always prone to disturbances, rebelled against this action, while the anti-Eustathians proposed Eusebius as the new bishop, but he declined.

After Eustathius had been removed, the Eusebians proceeded against Athanasius, a much more dangerous opponent. In 334 he was summoned before a synod in Cæsarea; he did not attend, however, distrusting his opponents. In the following year he was again summoned before a synod in Tyre at which Eusebius presided. Athanasius, divining the result, went to Constantinople to bring his cause before the emperor. The emperor called the bishops to his court, among them Eusebius. Athanasius was condemned and exiled at the end of 335. At the same synod, another opponent was successfully attacked. Marcellus of Ancyra (q.v.) had long opposed the Eusebians, and had only lately protested against the reinstitution of Arius. He was accused of Sabellianism and deposed in the beginning of 336. Constantine died the next year and Eusebius did not long survive him.

II. Works: Of the extensive literary activity of Eusebius, a relatively large portion has been preserved. Although posterity suspected him of Arianism, Eusebius had made himself indispensable by his method of authorship; his comprehensive and careful excerpts from original sources saved his successors the painstaking labor of research. Hence much has been preserved which otherwise would have been destroyed. The literary productions of Eusebius reflect on the whole the course of his life. At first he occupied himself with works on Biblical criticism, under the influence of Pamphilus and probably of Dorotheus of the School of Antioch. Afterward the persecutions under Diocletian and Galerius directed his attention to the martyrs of his own time and the past. And this led him to the history of the whole Church and finally to the history of the world, which to him was only a preparation for ecclesiastical history. Then followed the time of the Arian controversies, and dogmatic questions came into the foreground. Christianity at last found recognition by the State, and this brought new problems—apologies of a different sort had to be prepared. Lastly, Eusebius, the court theologian, wrote eulogies in praise of the first "Christian" emperor. To all this activity must be added numerous writings of a miscellaneous nature, addresses, letters, and the like, and exegetical works which include both commentaries and treatises on Biblical archeology and extend over the whole of his life.

Pamphilus and Eusebius occupied themselves with the text criticism of the Old Testament (Septuagint) and especially of the New Testament. An edition of the Septuagint seems to have been already prepared by Origen, which, according to

1. Works on Biblical Text Criticism.

Jerome, was revised and circulated by Eusebius and Pamphilus. For an easier survey of the material of the four Evangelists. Eusebius divided his edition of the New Testament into paragraphs and provided it with a synoptical table so that it might be easier to find the pericopes which belong together (see Bible Text, II., § 4).

The two greatest historical works of Eusebius are his "Chronicle" and his "Church History." The former (Gk. *Pantodapē historia*, "Universal History") is divided into two parts. The first part (Gk. *Chronographia*, "Annals") purports to give an epitome of universal history from the sources, arranged according to nations. The

second part (Gk. *Chronikoi kanones*, "Chronological Canons") attempts to furnish a synchronism of the historical material in parallel columns. The work as a whole has been lost in the original, but it may be reconstructed from later chronographists of the Byzantine school who made excerpts from the work with untiring diligence, especially Georgius Syncellus. The tables of the second part have been completely preserved in a Latin translation by Jerome, and both parts are still extant in an Armenian translation, but these translations do not possess great value on account of numerous interpolations. The "Chronicle" as preserved extends to the year 325. It was written before the "Church History."

2. The "Chronicle."

In his "Church History," Eusebius attempted according to his own declaration (I., i. 1) to present the history of the Church from the apostles to his own time, with special regard to the following points: (1) the successions of bishops in the principal sees; (2) the history of Christian teachers; (3) the history of heresies; (4) the history of the Jews; (5) the relations to the heathen; (6) the martyrdoms (I., i. 1–3). He grouped his material according to the reigns of the emperors, presenting it as he found it in his sources. The contents are as follows: After a detailed introduction, which treats of Jesus Christ (book i.), comes the history of the apostolic time to the capture of Jerusalem (book ii.); then the following time to Trajan (book iii.); books iv. and v. treat of the second century; book vi. of the time from Severus to Decius; book vii. extends to the outbreak of the persecution under Diocletian; book viii. treats of this persecution; book ix. brings the history to the victory over Maxentius in the West and over Maximinus in the East; book x. relates the reestablishment of the churches and the rebellion and conquest of Licinius. In its present form the work was brought to a conclusion before the death of Crispus (July, 326), and, since book x. is dedicated to Paulinus of Tyre who died before 325, at the end of 323 or in 324. This work required the most comprehensive preparatory studies, and it must have occupied him for years. His collection of martyrdoms of the older period (see below, § 4) may have been one of these preparatory studies. The authenticity of Eusebius's "Church History" is beyond dispute. Every new discovery shows anew the conscientious, careful and intelligent use of the libraries of Cæsarea and Jerusalem.

3. The "Church History."

Before he compiled his church history, Eusebius edited a collection of martyrdoms of the earlier period and a biography of Pamphilus. The martyrology has not survived as a whole, but it has been preserved almost completely in parts. It contained (1) an epistle of the congregation of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp; (2) the martyrdom of Pionius; (3) the martyrdoms of Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonike; (4) the martyrdoms in the congregations of Vienne and Lyons; (5) the martyrdom of Apollonius. Of the life of Pamphilus only a fragment survives. A work on the martyrs of Palestine in the time of Diocletian was composed after 311; numerous fragments are scattered in legendaries which still have to be collected. The life of Constantine was compiled after the death of the emperor and the election of his sons at Augusti (337). It is more a rhetorical eulogy on the emperor than a history, but is of great value on account of numerous documents incorporated in it.

4. Minor Historical Works.

To the class of apologetic and dogmatic works belong: (1) the "Apology for Origen," the first five books of which, according to the definite statement of Photius, were written by Pamphilus in prison, with the assistance of Eusebius. Eusebius added the sixth book after the death of Pamphilus. We possess only a translation of the first book, made by Rufinus; (2) a treatise against Hierocles (a Roman governor and Neoplatonic philosopher), in which Eusebius combated the former's glorification of Apollonius of Tyana in a work entitled "A Truth-loving Discourse" (Gk. *Philalēthēs logos*); (3) and (4) the two prominent and closely connected works commonly known by the Latin titles *Præparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica*, the first attempts to prove the excellence of Christianity over every pagan religion and philosophy. The *Præparatio* consists of fifteen books which have been completely preserved. Eusebius considered it an introduction to Christianity for heathen. The *Demonstratio* comprised originally twenty books of which ten have been completely preserved and a fragment of the fifteenth. Here Eusebius treats of the person of Jesus Christ. The work was probably finished before 311; (5) another work which originated in the time of the persecution, entitled "Prophetic Extracts" (*Eklogai prophētikai*). It discusses in four books the Messianic texts of Holy Scripture; (6) the treatise "On Divine Manifestation" (*Peri theophaneias*), dating from a much later time. It treats of the incarnation of the Divine Logos, and its contents are in many cases identical with the *Demonstratio evangelica*. Only fragments are preserved; (7) the polemical treatise "Against Marcellus," dating from about 337; (8) a supplement to the last-named work, entitled "On the Theology of the Church," in which he defended the Nicene doctrine of the Logos against the party of Athanasius. A number of writings, belonging in this category, have been entirely lost.

5. Apologetic and Dogmatic Works.

Of the exegetical works of Eusebius nothing has been preserved in its original form. The so-called commentaries are based upon late manuscripts copied from fragments of catenæ. A more comprehensive work of an exegetical nature, preserved only in fragments, is entitled "On the Differences of the Gospels" and was written for the purpose of harmonizing the contradictions in the reports of the different Evangelists. It was also for exegetical purposes that Eusebius wrote his treatises on Biblical archeology,

6. Exegetical and Miscellaneous Works.

viz.: (1) a work on the Greek equivalents of Hebrew Gentilic nouns; (2) a description of old Judea with an account of the lots of the ten tribes; (3) a plan of Jerusalem and the temple of Solomon. These three treatises have been lost. A work entitled "On the Names of Places in the Holy Scriptures," an alphabetical list of place names, is still in existence. Further mention is to be made of addresses and sermons some of which have been preserved, e.g., a sermon on the consecration of the church in Tyre, and an address on the thirtieth anniversary of the reign of Constantine (336). Of the letters of Eusebius only a few fragments are extant.

III. Estimate of Eusebius: From a dogmatic point of view, Eusebius stands entirely upon the shoulders of Origen. Like Origen, he started from the fundamental thought of the absolute sovereignty (*monarchia*) of God. God is the cause of all beings. But he is not merely a cause; in him everything good is included, from him all life originates, and he is the source of all virtue. He is the highest God to whom Christ is subject as the second God. God sent Christ into the world that it may partake of the blessings included in the essence of God. Christ is the only really good creature, he possesses the image of God and is a ray of the eternal light; but the figure of the ray is so limited by Eusebius that he expressly emphasizes the self-existence of Jesus. Eusebius was intent upon emphasizing the difference of the persons of the Trinity and maintaining the subordination of Jesus to God (he never calls him *theos*) because in all contrary attempts he suspected polytheism or Sabellianism. Jesus is a creature of God whose generation, it is true, took place before time. Jesus is in his activity the organ of God, the creator of life, the principle of every revelation of God, who in his absoluteness is enthroned above all the world. This divine Logos assumed a human body without being altered thereby in any way in his being. The relation of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity Eusebius explained similarly to that of the Son to the Father. No point of this doctrine is original with Eusebius, all is traceable to his teacher Origen. The lack of originality in his thinking shows itself in the fact that he never presented his thoughts in a system. He lacked a leading idea.

1. His Doctrine.

The limitations of Eusebius are closely connected with his gifts. His time justly considered him its most learned man. A list of the sources he used for his church history would show what an amount of work had to be done to elaborate and sift the mass of material. But the learning of Eusebius can not be measured with that of Origen. Origen was a productive spirit, Eusebius a compiler. Eusebius, however, distinguished himself by his carefulness. A man like Eusebius was not without weight in the time when barbarian nations began to invade the Church in large masses. In the time which followed nobody excelled him in learning. Church historians were able to copy him, but they could not supply his place. As a writer he can not be highly estimated. His style is without grace and brilliancy, his phraseology often monotonous, and his rhetoric cumbrous.

2. His Excellencies and Limitations.

(Erwin Preuschen.)

Bibliography: The earlier works on Eusebius are noted in Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 335 sqq., Hamburg, 1801; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 551–586 (cf. II., i. 70 sqq.) contains a full account of the separate writings, with some mention of editions; important prolegomena are contained in *NPNF*, 2d ser., vol. i. Of his works the only relatively complete edition is *MPG*, xix.–xxiv, (omits the writings which exist only in Syriac, the *Topica* and many important fragments); the edition by G. Dindorf, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1867–71 is practically a selection. Of the "History" the *editio princeps* was by Robert Stephen, Paris, 1544, and contained the *Præparatio* and the *Demonstratio*, as well as the *Vita Constantini;* an edition was issued with a Lat. transl. by H. Valesius, Paris, 1659; one of the best is by F. A. Heinichen, Leipsic, 1827–28, 2d ed., 3 vols., 1868–70, the latter containing the *Vita Constantini*, *Panegyricus*, and the *Oratio ad sanctorum cœtum* of Constantine; E. Burton issued an edition, 2 vols., Oxford, 1838, 1845, reprinted by W Bright, 1872, 1881 (the last a handy edition). The Migne ed. is a reprint of the text of Schwegler, Tübingen, 1852. The best is the ed. still in progress under the care of a commission of the Prussian Academy, Berlin, 1902 sqq. The "History" in Syriac was edited from the MSS. of W. Wright, with a collation of the Armenian version by Dr. A. Merx, Cambridge, 1898. The "History" has been translated into nearly all the European languages. The version which has been most current in English is by C. F. Crusé, Philadelphia, 1833, often reprinted in the United States and Great Britain, and is in Bohn's *Ecclesiastical Library*. This is superseded by A. C. McGiffert in *NPNF*, 2d ser., vol. i (accompanied by full prolegomena and notes so copious that they make the volume a complete history of the Ante-Nicene period. The same volume contains the *Vita Constantini* and *Panegyricus* translated with prolegomena by E. C. Richardson). Of the *Chronicon* the one edition of note is Schoene's, Berlin, 1875 (with valuable prolegomena); it was published in the Armenian version by Mai and Zohrab, Milan, 1818; the Lat. version of Jerome was issued by J. J. Scaliger, Leyden, 1606, and the Bodleian MS. was published in collotype by J. K. Fotheringham, Oxford, 1905; J. B. Aucher published it in Armenian, Greek and Latin, Venice, 1818; T. Gaisford edited the *Præparatio* in Gk. with a Lat. version, 4 vols., Oxford, 1843, and the *Demonstratio*, also in Gk. and Lat., ib. 1852; the *Onomasticon* was edited by F. Larsow and G. Parthey, Berlin, 1862, and by P. de Lagarde, Göttingen, 1870. An Eng. transl. of the *Præparatio* is by E. H. Gifford, 2 vols., Oxford. 1903, and of the *Theophania or Divine Manifestation of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, from the Syriac, by S. Lee, Cambridge, 1843.

The "Life" by Jerome is in *De vir. ill.*, lxxxi. Consult W. Cave, *Lives of the . . Fathers of the Church*, ed. H. Cary, ii. 95–144, Oxford, 1840. The editions of the "History" generally contain a life and discussions of the literary and other activities of Eusebius (especially valuable is A. C. McGiffert in *NPNF*, ut sup.), and the Church Histories devote considerable space to the subject (e.g. Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 871–879). *DCAB*, ii. 308–348 is the fullest of the encyclopedia articles (cf. *KL*, iv. 1001–07); indispensable is the article by E. Schwartz in the Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart, 1893 sqq.

On special phases of the subject consult: C. G. Haenell, *De Eusebio Cæsareensi*, Göttingen, 1843; J. H. Newman, *Arians of the 4th Century*, London, 1871; V. Hely, *Eusèbe de Césarée*, Paris, 1877; A. von Gutschmid, *Untersuchungen über die syrische Epitome des eusebischen Canones*, Stuttgart, 1886; A. Halmel, *Die Entstehung der Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius*, Essen, 1896; W. Lefroy, *Lectures on Eccl. Hist.*, London, 1896.

EUSEBIUS OF DORYLÆUM. See Eutychianism, § 2.

EUSEBIUS OF EMESA: Bishop of Emesa; d. about 360. He came of a noble family of Edessa. Having received his first instruction at Edessa, he

went to Palestine, where Eusebius of Cæsarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis became his teachers. But he soon turned from their allegorical elucidation of Scripture to the exegetical principles of the school of Antioch. From Antioch he went to Alexandria, where he sought to provide the philosophical foundation for his knowledge. He returned to Antioch prior to 340, having already won such a name for himself as exegete and orator that in 341 the Synod of Antioch designated him successor to the deposed Athanasius. Eusebius, however, shrank from the difficulties of this position, and he was made bishop of the small city of Emesa in Phenicia, where he spent the rest of his life. At first the Emesans took offense at his extensive learning, which embraced magic and astrology, and for a short time he was compelled to flee to Laodicea. His biography was written by his friend George of Laodicea. Only a brief extract from this work has been preserved (Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 9; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 6).

Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, xci.) mentions writings of Eusebius against Jews, pagans, and Novatians, besides ten books of commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians and homilies on the Gospels. Theodoret (*Hær.*, I., xxv. 26) mentions polemical works against Marcionites and Manicheans; and Philoxenus of Mabug (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, ii. 28) certain discourses and a work on faith, which is possibly the source of the dogmatic fragments preserved in Theodoret's *Eranistes* (*Dial.*, iii.). Further, some exegetical fragments survive in catenæ (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 1, pp. 545–562), and a fragment from a Lenten sermon (W Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, ii. 837, London, 1871. Thilo (*Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emisa*, Halle, 1832, pp. 64, 79), showed that the first two Latin homilies of those published by Sirmond (*Opuscula XIV Eusebii Pamphili*, Paris, 1643) under the name of Eusebius of Cæsarea, directed against Marcellus of Ancyra, are probably by Eusebius of Emesa. On the other hand, the Latin homilies attributed to Eusebius by Gagnaius (Paris, 1547) and Fremy in 1554 (cf. *Bibliotheca maxima patrum*, 28 vols., Lyons, 1677–1707, vol. vi. 618—622) are works of Western (Gallican) authors.

Meager as the extant fragments of Eusebius are, they attest him to be a writer of no mean ability, and Jerome (l.c.) depreciates him unjustly. He was one of the most influential leaders of the great theologians of Antioch, not only in his manner of exposition, but also in his Christology. He was averse to dogmatic disputations, and saw in verbal strife the main reason for ecclesiastical ruptures. In his tendency to maintain the older incompleteness of dogma against the progress of doctrinal definition he felt himself allied with semi-Arianism whose leaders included most of his friends and teachers. G. Krüger.

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 412 sqq., Hamburg, 1801; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iv. 318–319; *DCB*, ii. 358–359.

EUSEBIUS OF LAODICEA: Bishop of Laodicea in Syria in the third century; d. there before 268. He was originally a deacon in Alexandria, where he distinguished himself during the Valerian persecution by his piety, his care for the captives, and his burial of the dead. A few years later in the Roman siege of Brucchium, a quarter of Alexandria, he and Anatolius secured permission for all non-combatants to withdraw under safe-conduct, and shortly afterward (263?) both went to Syria to take part in the controversy involving Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch. There he was appointed bishop of Laodicea, succeeding Socrates, but died before the synod which finally condemned Paul, which was held in 268 (?). Jerome's Chronicle, however, states that Eusebius was famous as a teacher about 274, and that he was succeeded by Anatolius in 279. (Edgar Henneke.)

Bibliography: The early source is Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 11, 32, *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. i. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv. 304; M. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, ii. 792, Paris, 1740; J. M. Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, i. 77, London, 1847; *DCB*, ii. 359.

EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA AND CONSTANTINOPLE: Bishop of Berytus, in Phenicia, then of Nicomedia, where the imperial court resided, and finally of Constantinople (as early as 338), where he died 341. Distantly related to the imperial house, he not only owed his removal from an insignificant to the most splendid episcopal see to his influence at court, but the great power he wielded in the Church was derived from that source. With the exception of a short period of eclipse, he enjoyed the complete confidence both of Constantine and Constantius; and it was he who baptized the former May, 337. Like Arius, he was a pupil of Lucian of Antioch, and it is probable that he held the same views as Arius from the very beginning. He afterward modified his ideas somewhat, or perhaps he only yielded to the pressure of circumstances; but he was, if not the teacher, at all events the leader and organizer, of the Arian party. At the Council of Nicæa (325) he signed the Confession, but only after a long and desperate opposition. His defense of Arius excited the wrath of the emperor, and a few months after the council he was sent into exile. After the lapse of three years, he succeeded in regaining the imperial favor; and after his return (in 329) he brought the whole machinery of the state government into action in order to impose his views upon the Church. See Arianism.

Bibliography: Sources (contradictory and impossible of reconciliation) are: Athanasius "Against the Arians" and "Apology," both in Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. iv.; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, books i.–ii., and Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, books i.–ii., both in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. ii.; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, i. 4–9, in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. iii. Consult: W. Bright, *Hist. of the Church*, 311–451, Oxford, 1860; idem, *Orations of St. Athanasius, . with Account of his Life*, London, 1873; J. H. Newman, *Arians of the 4th Cent.*, ib. 1876; *DCB*, ii. 360–367 (detailed).

EUSEBIUS PAMPHILI. See Eusebius of Cæsarea.

EUSEBIUS OF SAMOSATA: Bishop of Samosata; d. at Doliche, in Syria, June 22, 380. He took part in the synodical deliberations at Antioch in the winter of 360–361, and appears among the Homœan and Homœousian bishops who in 363,

at a synod held under Meletius of Antioch, accepted the formula *homoousios*. He seems to have been a member of the right wing of the Eastern opposition party, in substantial agreement with Meletius (q.v.), like whom he became, after 363, a representative of neo-Nicene orthodoxy. He was in close relations with Basil, whose elevation to the see of Cæsarea he did much to further, to whom in later conflicts and in his relations with the West he was a faithful friend up to the time of his banishment in 374. He was sent first to Cappadocia and then to Thrace, where he lived through the Gothic war, his return being made possible by the death of Valens. He was at the synod held in Sept., 379, nine months after Basil's death. According to Theodoret he was killed at Doliche, whither he had gone to attend the consecration of Bishop Maris, by a stone thrown by an Arian woman, on which ground he was honored as a martyr. Some other details of his life, as given by Theodoret, are obviously legendary. But this may safely be said to his credit—that he is one of the few bishops of the fourth century of whom nothing but good is known.

(F Loofs.)

Bibliography: Sources are: The "Letters" of Gregory Nazianzen and of Basil, in *NPNF*, 2d ser., vols. vii.–viii; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 27–28, iv. 12, v. 4. Consult: *ASB*, June iv. 235–242; V Ernst, in *ZKG*, xvi (1896), 626–664; F. Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe* Halle, 1898; *DCB* ii. 369–372.

EUSEBIUS OF THESSALONICA: Bishop of Thessalonica c. 600. He wrote a polemic work in ten books against one Andrew, a monk belonging to the Aphthartodocetæ. That the Eusebius to whom Photius (*Bibliotheca*, codex clxii.) ascribes the work was Eusebius of Thessalonica is clearly shown by one of a number of letters which Gregory the Great wrote to this Eusebius (*Epist.*. xi. 55 [74]).

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 527; *DCB*, 373–374.

EUSEBIUS OF VERCELLI: Bishop of Vercelli, one of the most determined opponents of Arianism in the reign of Constantius; d. 370. He was a Sardinian by birth; but what the traditional *Vita* relates as to his parents, his baptism by Pope Eusebius, his ordination by Pope Marcus, and his consecration by Pope Julius I. is either false or untrustworthy. All known is that he was a reader in Rome, and sent from that position to be bishop of a city entirely strange to him, probably some time before 354. He was the first bishop of Vercelli, besides which Novara, Ivrea and Tortona seem to have been under his jurisdiction. Practically nothing is known of his administration before 354, unless Tillemont's conclusion from the words of Ambrose (*Epist.*, lxiii.) may be accepted, that the erection of a quasi-monastic house in Vercelli, in which Eusebius lived with his clergy, belongs to that period. This, at least, Ambrose says definitely, that Eusebius was the first in the West to combine the life of city clergy with monastic discipline. After the Synod of Arles (353), Liberius of Rome desired to see the weak concession of his legates repaired by another synod, and Eusebius was a member of the embassy, headed by Lucifer of Cagliari, which approached the emperor with a petition to that effect. The new synod was held in Milan, probably in the spring of 355. Eusebius at first remained away; and when he appeared, in company of the Roman legates, the synod had practically reached its conclusion. Eusebius, required to assent to the condemnation of Athanasius, asked for a discussion of the faith of the council, declaring himself willing to agree to any action which should be prefaced by an acceptance of the Nicene decrees. Dionysius of Milan was about to subscribe such a document when Valens snatched the pen and paper from his hand and withdrew with his party to the palace. The outcome of the proceedings for Eusebius was his banishment, first to Scythopolis in Palestine, then to Cappadocia, and finally to the neighborhood of Alexandria. After Julian's accession he took part in the Alexandrian synod of 362, and then went as a special envoy to the church of Antioch, where he was unable to prevent a schism, as Lucifer had already consecrated Paulinus. Not long after, he returned to Italy, where, with Hilary of Poitiers, he took a decided stand against the few Arians found in the West, especially Auxentius, the bishop of Milan. The legend which attributes his death to stoning at the hands of the Arians, although his epitaph calls him a martyr, is untrustworthy.

(F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: The three "Letters" of Eusebius are in Gallandi, *Bibliotheca*, v. 78, and in *MPL*, xii. Sources for a biography are: Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, xcvi.; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 5–6, 9, and Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 9, v. 13 (both in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. ii.). F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, iv. 747–748, Venice, 1719; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vii. 529–563, 771–780, Venice, 1732; *DCB*, ii. 374–375; *KL*, iv. 1013–15.

EUSTACHIUS, yu-stê'ki-us **(EUSTATHIUS), SAINT:** According to a late tradition, a Roman martyr who, with his family, was put to death in 118. Before his baptism he was called Placidus, and he is said to have been converted by a vision as he was hunting in the forest, of a cross between the antlers of the stag he was pursuing, while a voice cried to him: "Why persecutest thou me?" After being exposed in vain to the lions in the amphitheater, Eustachius and his family are said to have been burned to death in an oven shaped like a stag. In the Western Church the martyrdom of Eustachius had been commemorated on Sept. 20 since the early Middle Ages, while the Greek Church appoints Nov. 20 for this feast. A basilica of St. Eustachius existed in Rome in the eighth century and apparently even in the time of Gregory the Great, and relics of the saint were taken thence to various places, including St. Denis and Paris. Eustachius is the patron saint of Madrid, and he is also one of the fourteen "helpers in need" (q.v.), being the special protector of pious hunters.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: *ASB*, Sept., vi. 106–137; *Analecta Bollandiana*, iii. 66–112, Paris, 1884; Nicephorus Callistus, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 29; M. Armellini, *Le Chiese di Roma*, pp. 234–236, Rome, 1887; F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte Roms*, iii. 578–583, Stuttgart, 1895–96, Eng. transl., iii. 553–556, iv. 420, 458, London, 1895–96; *DCB*, ii. 380–381.

EUSTASIUS, yu-stê'shi-us. Second abbot of Luxeuil; d. 629. He was of noble family, nephew

of Bishop Mietius of Langres, and as *discipulus et minister* stood in close connection with Columban himself after being received into the monastery at Luxeuil. After Columban had been driven from Luxeuil, Eustasius aided him in his missionary activity by Lake Constance (see COLUMBAN). It is possible that Columban appointed him his successor in the restored mother cloister. At any rate Eustasius was abbot there from 614 with the sanction of King Clothair II. and had supervision over the monasteries connected with Luxeuil. According to the representation of his biographer, who knew him personally, Eustasius was a learned, eloquent, and active man. The bishops Donatus of Besançon, Aichar of Tournai, Chagnoald of Laon, Ragnachar of Basel, the abbots Amatus of Remiremont, Waldebert of Luxeuil, Agilus of Resbais, and the abbess Burgundofara of Faremoutier were his pupils; St. Salaberga was won by him for the spiritual life. He changed nothing in the order of Columban and zealously followed the penitential regulations of the latter (see COLUMBAN). He retained the Irish form of the mass, the tonsure, and daily discipline, as may be seen from the charges made against him by Agrestius (*Vita Columbani*, ii. 9), but as the Irish celebration of Easter disappears from the charges, it is probable that he ultimately abandoned it. Eustasius also labored for the conversion of heretical and heathen natives; he succeeded in making the Wariskians, dwelling on both sides of the middle Doubs, who followed Bonosus (q.v.), adherents of the Catholic Church. With Agilus he undertook a missionary journey to the Bavarians, but met with slight success. His anniversary is given by Jonas as Apr. 29, but in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (*ASB*, Nov., ii. 38) as Apr. 2.

OTTO SEEBASS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The one source is the life by the Abbot Jonas, in book ii., chaps. 7–10, of the *Vita Columbani*, printed in *MGH, Script. rer. Merov.*, iv (1902), 119–130, and in *ASM*, ii. 108–111, cf. pp. 302 sqq., 405 sqq. Consult: S. Riezler, *Geschichte Bayerns*, i. 77, Gotha, 1878; Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 188; Hauck, *KD*, i. 286 et passim; *DCB*, ii. 381.

EUSTATHIANS. See MESSALIANS.

EUSTATHIUS, yu-stē'thī-us, OF ANTIOCH: Bishop of Antioch; d. probably c. 337 He was apparently a native of Side in Pamphylia, was bishop of Berœa about 320, and was transferred to Antioch before the first Council of Nicæa. He was one of the few decided anti-Arians in the East, and carried on a literary polemic against Eusebius of Cæsarea (q.v.) which made him well hated by the unorthodox party. They succeeded in effecting his deposition in 330, and he was banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace, where he died and was buried. Jerome says that "he composed many works against the doctrine of the Arians"; but only one is preserved entire, *De Engastrimytho contra Origenem* (best edition by Jahn, *TU*, ii. 4, Tübingen, 1886). Fragments are preserved of a *De anima* mentioned by Jerome; of another work in eight books *Contra Arianos*; of treatises on Prov. viii. 22 and ix. 5; of one on Melchisedek; of two *In inscriptiones psalmorum*; and of expositions of certain separate psalms. The commentary on the first part of Genesis (*MPG*, xviii. 705–1066) is generally considered spurious, and the "Liturgy of St. Eustathius" (ib. 697–704) is hardly more authentic. (F. LOOFS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources for a life, by no means reliable, are collected in L. Allatius, *Eustathii in Hexaemeron commentarius*, pp. 112–142, Lyons, 1629. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vii. 21–31, 646–656; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix. 131–149, Hamburg, 1804; J. Fessler, *Institutiones patrologiæ*, i. 427–431, Innsbruck, 1890; *DCB*, ii. 382–383. An *In Lazarum, Mariam et Martham homilia Christologica*, attributed to Eustathius of Antioch, was published, Paris, 1905.

EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE: Bishop of Sebaste (Sebasteia, the capital of Armenia prima, the modern Sivas); b. at Sebaste c. 300; d. after 377. He seems to have been the son of Bishop Eulalius of Sebaste. His early theological education was influenced by the teachings of Arius, but he kept aloof from the dogmatic dissensions of his time, being attracted entirely by the ascetic ideal. He became presbyter, but on account of his ascetic tendencies fell out with his own father, who excluded him from the communion of prayers (Sozomen, IV., xxiv. 9; Socrates, II., xliii. 1). Some years later he was censured by a synod at Cæsarea, probably for the same reason. Eusebius of Constantinople deposed him, but the number of his disciples increased. A synod at Gangra, about 340, investigated the complaints against Eustathius. His disciples were accused of denying salvation to married persons, of favoring their separation from each other, of holding objectionable meetings, of wearing unbecoming garments, of accepting payments in kind which were due to the Church, and of other misdemeanors. Eustathius himself seems to have been free from eccentricities, and his reputation apparently deterred his opponents from attacking him directly.

Of the next thirteen years nothing is known except that Eustathius became bishop of Sebaste about 356. He is heard of again after the return of Basil to his native country. Basil had also been won for the ascetic ideal, and Eustathius seemed to him the incarnation of monastic virtue. For about a decade and a half, until 372 and 373, they were united by the most intimate friendship and agreed also in doctrine. Eustathius had relinquished his Arianism long before; being averse to all dogmatic extremes, he took the part of the Homoiousians. He was present at the Synod of Ancyra in 358 and was one of the envoys who were sent to the court. The followers of Acacius, however, brought it about that a synod in Melitene, probably in the same year, deposed him from his bishopric, not for dogmatic reasons, but on account of his conduct; there had probably been brought forward complaints like those in Gangra. Meletius of Melitene, later bishop of Antioch, at that time a partizan of Acacius, became his successor. But later Eustathius was one of the Homoiousian deputies who represented the cause of the majority of Seleucia at the court. Like the other deputies he accepted the formula of Nicæa in Constantinople, but he fearlessly expressed his own convictions in the negotiations, and when he was deposed on that account, he did not acknowledge the fact

and dared to oppose his enemies in sermons and open letters although the favor of the court was evidently on their side. When under Jovian and in the first period of Valens the Homoiousian party gathered again, Eustathius was one of its most energetic leaders, and when the edict of Valens in 365 again expelled all bishops who had been deposed under Constantius, Eustathius as deputy of several Homoiousian synods went to Rome in 366 and testified to his own and their consent to the Nicene Creed. Nevertheless a rupture took place in 373 between Eustathius and Basil since the latter had become a friend of Meletius of Antioch, the former opponent and rival of Eustathius. There was also a dogmatic difference between them concerning the Holy Spirit. Eustathius considered the Holy Spirit neither created nor divine, but kept aloof from both extremes and became the leader of the Pneumatomachi (see MACEDONIANS AND THE MACEDONIAN SECT) in Asia Minor. He made the impression in large circles of an attractive personality and an efficient preacher, as the leader of the first monks, and as the founder of one of the first hospitals (in Sebaste).

(F. LOOFS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources of knowledge are Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 43, and Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 14 (both in *NPNF*, 2d ser., vol. ii.). Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. ix.; H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, Cambridge, 1882; F. Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe*, Halle, 1898; *DCB*, ii. 383–387 (censorious); *KL*, iv. 1017–19.

EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA: Greek metropolitan; b. at Constantinople, early in the twelfth century; d. at Thessalonica between 1192 and 1194. He seems to have been originally a monk in the cloister of St. Florus in Constantinople, as well as deacon of St. Sophia and teacher of rhetoric, and he likewise held the court position of Master of Petitions. In 1175 he was appointed bishop of Myra in Lycia, but before his consecration the emperor made him the successor of Constantius as metropolitan of Thessalonica, a position which he held for the remainder of his life. About 1180 the emperor Manuel protested formally against the formula of abjuration in which the God of Mohammed was anathematized as a "wholly hammered God" (*theos holosphuros*, i.e., the massive, compact, not begetting and not begotten God), considering it blasphemous and offensive to converts from Islam. Eustathius, however, boldly opposed him at a synod and justified the anathema, though without losing favor at court. During the siege and sack of Thessalonica by the Normans under William II. of Sicily (1185), the metropolitan remained at his post, protecting his flock and checking the fury of the conquerors, as he himself recounts in his *De Thessalonica urbe a Normannis capta*. Despite this, he met with much opposition, and he may even have been driven from his see for a time, thus accounting for the fact that some of his works were written elsewhere than in Thessalonica. As monk, bishop, theologian, and author, Eustathius rose superior to his contemporaries, and he opposed with all his might the formalism which threatened the welfare of his Church, writing in this spirit his treatise "On Hypocrisy" as well as his still more important "Consideration of Monastic Life." He was the author of many other works, including a famous commentary on the Homeric poems. (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *De Thessalonica* is in *MPG*, cxxxvi. For his other works and literature on them, and his life, consult Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 536–541.

EUSTOCHIUM. See PAULA.

EUTHALIUS, yu-thê'lî-us: The putative author of certain matter introductory to the Epistles of Paul, the Catholic Epistles, and the Acts, comparable to the Masorah of the Old Testament. As pointed out by Dean Robinson, the material has grown gradually. First a new system of writing the New Testament books was adopted from the schools of grammar and rhetoric; to facilitate the public reading in service, only so much was put in one line as could be pronounced in one breath, in place of the lines of equal length without punctuation or word division of the older manuscripts (ℵ, B, A, C). Jerome did the same for the Latin text and Hesychius of Jerusalem in the sixth century for the Greek prophets. The first "Euthalius" supplied about the middle of the fourth century tables of chapters and of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, with three prologues to the Epistles and Acts, including biographical and chronological researches. In 396 a short account of Paul's martyrdom was added and perhaps other parts of the work, as the Stichometry (q.v.) and the collation with the famous *Codex Pamphili* at Cæsarea, also the division of "the Apostle" into fifty-seven lections (Gk. *anagnōseis*). The so-called *hypotheseis* (*argumenta*), short introductions to each book, originally a part of the pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis scripturæ sacræ*, were afterward incorporated in the Euthalian apparatus in most Greek manuscripts and in the commentary of the so-called Oecumenius.

According to Zaccagni "Euthalius" was a deacon of Alexandria when he edited the Pauline epistles (458), and bishop of Sulke (an unknown Egyptian city, perhaps Pselche) in the time of Athanasius II. of Alexandria (489–496) when he published the Acts and Catholic Epistles. This theory was based upon a chronological datum found in only a few manuscripts of the *Martyrium Pauli* and now generally held to be a late addition. Ehrhard supposed "Euthalius" to be an intentional alteration of "Evagrius" (found in Codex H and a Naples MS.), made when Evagrius Ponticus (q.v.) came to be suspected of heresy. Von Soden proposed a new solution of the problem. There was a Bishop Euthalius of Sulci in Sardinia in the seventh century whose confession of faith, composed in the time of the Monothelite controversy, Wobbermin discovered in a manuscript of the Lawra, while von der Goltz found a quasidevotional monologue, *Eis emauton*, of the same in a manuscript of Chalcis, identical with the so-called "Prayer of Euthalius" contained in many Armenian Bibles. Von Soden accordingly conjectured that all the Euthalian apparatus originated in the seventh century. His theory

has been severely criticized (cf. F. C. Conybeare in *ZNTW*, v., 1904, pp. 39–52; T. Zahn, *NKZ*, xv., 1904, pp. 305–330, 375–390; J. A. Robinson, in *JTS*, vi., 1905, pp. 87–90), and neglects late investigations, such as Robinson's convincing argument that the oldest materials must have existed before 396 and Von Dobschütz's induction from the Syriac versions that the work in its fuller form lay before Philoxenus of Mabug when he translated the New Testament into Syriac in 508. Either there must have been another Euthalius older than the bishop of Sulci (to whom perhaps the title "bishop of Sulci" was given by confusion with the latter), or the seventh century Euthalius used the work of an unknown earlier writer, adding perhaps some new matter of his own.

Only a full examination of all New Testament manuscripts and the versions can throw new light on the question. A new edition of the Euthalian apparatus is needed, as Zaccagni's first edition was based on only a few manuscripts. A greater difficulty is that of reconstructing the true text used and approved by Euthalius. What is called the *Euthalius Codex* in Tischendorf is but a single manuscript of comparatively recent date.

E. von Dobschütz.

Bibliography: The material is collected in L. A. Zaccagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum ecclesiæ*, i. 401–708, liv.–xcvi., Rome, 1698, and thence reprinted with many faults and without the prolegomena in *MPG*, lxxxv. 619–790. Consult *DB*, Supplement vol., pp. 524–529 (essential); Islinger, *Die Verdienste des Euthalius um den neutestamentlichen Bibeltext*, Hof, 1867; W Bousset, in *TU*, xi. 4, 1894; F. C. Conybeare, *On the Codex Pamphili and the Date of Euthalius*, in the *Journal of Philology*, xxiii (1895), 241 sqq.; J. A. Robinson, *Euthaliana*, in *TS*, iii. 3, Cambridge, 1895; T. Zahn, in *TLB*, 1895, pp. 593 sqq., 601 sqq.; E. von Dobschütz, *Euthaliusstudien*, in *ZKG*, xix (1898), 107–154; H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des N. T.*, i. 637 sqq., Berlin, 1902.

EUTHYMIUS, yu-thî'mî-us, ZIGABENUS (ZIGADENUS, ZYGADENUS): Byzantine theologian; d. near Constantinople after 1118. Of his life few details are known, except that he was a monk at a cloister in the vicinity of Constantinople. A Latin translation of his commentary on the Psalms was published by Philippus Saulus (Verona, 1530); the Greek original was edited by A. Bongiovanni in the fourth volume of the works of Theophylact (Venice, 1754–63). The commentary on the Gospels appeared in a Latin translation by Johannes Hintenius (Louvain, 1544), the Greek text remained unpublished until C. F. Mattäi's edition (Leipsic, 1792); the commentary on the Pauline Epistles was first edited by N. Kalogeras at Athens in 1887 Other exegetical writings on the Catholic Epistles, letters, an elegy on the death of Eustathius of Thessalonica, and a controversy with a Saracen philosopher exist only in manuscript. In his commentary on the Gospels, which is superior to that on the Psalms, Euthymius follows in general the ancient authorities, especially Chrysostom, although he shows some independence. Allegorical and mystical interpretations are occasionally borrowed. On the whole, he is inferior in exegetical precision to Theophylact.

The dogmatic work of Euthymius was written at the instance of the emperor Alexius and from him received its name of "Dogmatic Panoply" (ed. P. F. Zinus, Venice, 1555; M. H. Gregoras, Tergovist, 1711). It consists of two sections, or "titles," and of twenty-four others devoted to the refutation of various heresies. The accounts of the Bogomiles, Massilians, Armenians, Paulicians, and Mohammedans are of value, despite falsehoods and perversions. The attack on the Roman Catholic doctrines is concerned chiefly with the procession of the Holy Ghost and the use of unleavened bread. Much of the book is a mere compilation of the Church Fathers down to John of Damascus, and is important solely as containing excerpts from such obscure authors as Leontius of Byzantium, Anastasius of Sinai, Theodore the Studite, and Maximus. (Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: The life and writings are best discussed by N. Kalogeras in his edition of the Commentaries on the Pauline Letters by Euthymius, 2 vols., Athens, 1887, and in *Athenaion*, ix (1880), 255–284, x (1881), 331–362. Consult also: W Cave, *Script. eccl. hist. literaria*, vol. ii., Oxford, 1743; C. Ullmann, in *TSK*, vi (1833), 663–674; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 82–85 (life and list of works and editions), et passim.

EUTYCHIANISM, yu-tik'i-an-izm.

Compromise Between Alexandria and Antioch in 433 (§ 1).
The Beginning of Strife (§ 2).
The "Robber Synod" of Ephesus, 449 (§ 3).
The Council of Chalcedon, 451 (§ 4).

Eutychianism was a Christological heresy of the fifth century, taking its name from Eutyches, an ascetic, of strict monastic training, for thirty years superior of a monastery near Constantinople. The history of the struggle of the orthodox party with Eutyches up to the Council of Chalcedon is an unhappy chapter in church history, not alone because court cabals had a considerable share in it, but because it was less a struggle for purity of doctrine than for ecclesiastical power, turning to a large extent on questions of decisive importance in the development of the Alexandrian and Roman patriarchates and in the position of monasticism and of learning in the Church. As a chapter in the history of ideas, it offers one of the most confused and unedifying pictures in the whole of dogmatic development. This is not to adopt Harnack's view that the Monophysitism of Cyril was the legitimate outcome of Greek Christological development, or to pass judgment upon the ultimate solution adopted by the council, which, under the influence of the West, was the most rational then possible; it is simply an expression of distaste for the theological ignorance, thoughtlessness, and lack of conscience of which the history of the controversy is full.

The story begins in 433 with the union enforced by court influence between the parties of Alexandria and Antioch (see Nestorius, § 6) which had only concealed the opposition between their Christological teachings. It was, however, not without its effects. It was fatal to those who had refused to condemn Nestorius (q.v.), and compelled the submission of such men as Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata. It forced Cyril to take his stand in defense of formulas which had been worked out by the school of Antioch and could not be so

easily fitted in as some zealous Alexandrians then desired. It tended rather to favor the acceptance of two natures in Christ. It is true, there was in the East no theology with which these formulas were altogether harmonious. They corresponded to the traditions of the West, where it was possible to assert in the same breath the unity of the person and the duality of nature. In the West the conception of the single personality of Christ had, with unphilosophical simplicity, attached itself to the historic Christ, and thus prevented the assertion of two natures, for the purpose of emphasizing both the divinity and the humanity, from working out philosophically so as to endanger the conception of the unity, and the consequent intelligibility of the person of Jesus. In the East the word *prosōpon*, the nearest equivalent for the Latin *persona*, had by no means a wholly parallel sense. In its technical meaning it had been employed since the triumph of the later Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, as a synonym of *hypostasis*, though it could also be employed in the original signification, to denote a phenomenon, a figure presented to the senses, or the form under which either one or more *hypostases* are presented. It was thus very useful as a compromise formula. Both parties, however, accepted the compromise as an earnest of complete victory, the patriarch of Alexandria hoping in this for more than the mere triumph of the Alexandrian Christology. Since the days of Athanasius this see had acquired a position in the East which could inspire an ambitious bishop with the hope of dominating his rivals both at Antioch and Constantinople. This ambition was abundantly possessed by Cyril (see CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA), and nothing else explains his acceptance of the compromise. Peace, however, endured as long as John of Antioch and Proclus of Constantinople as well as Cyril lived; but it became less secure each year as the extreme tendencies on both sides came into play. This was especially the case on Cyril's side. It was not unnatural that some of his partizans, incapable of comprehending his fine distinctions, should push his Christology into what was practically Monophysitism. The proceedings against Nestorius for a while kept the opposition party quiet—though the most prominent theologian on that side, Theodoret, remained true to the fundamental principles of the school of Antioch. As time went on still more zealous upholders of the Antiochian views appeared among the bishops of Asia Minor. In 435 Ibas, who had censured the dogmatic position of Cyril and the synod of Ephesus and supported Theodore of Mopsuestia, became bishop of Edessa. In 441 or 442 John of Antioch was succeeded by Domnus, a more ardent partizan of the traditions of that see; this Domnus, between 443 and 447, filled the bishopric of Tyre, contrary to the canons, with a man who had been twice married, Irenæus, formerly a friend of Nestorius and exiled on this account about 435. After the death of Proclus (446), the see of Constantinople was filled by Flavian, who had indeed accepted the union but still came from the Antioch party. Cyril died in 444 and was succeeded by Dioscurus, much less important as a theologian, but still more unscrupulous in his struggle for supremacy, and willing to avail himself of monastic fanaticism and obscure intrigues to win the favor of both populace and court. The time was favorable to his purposes. The feeble emperor Theodosius (408–450), since the downfall of his sister Pulcheria's influence about 440, had been under that of his favorite Chrysaphius, who was in close relations with the Alexandrian party, especially with the aged presbyter and archimandrite Eutyches, who was among the most influential members of that party. Born in 378, Eutyches had acquired the reputation of an honorable and pious man, but was uneducated and unfamiliar with the laws of thought. As a veteran monk, and a zealous foe of Nestorianism, he counted as one of the heads of the monastic or Alexandrian party. He was accordingly a useful instrument in the hands of Dioscurus, whose principal agent in Constantinople he was after the death of Proclus.

1. Compromise between Alexandria and Antioch in 433.

On Feb. 17, 448, the emperor renewed the edict against the Nestorians, and decreed the deposition of Irenæus of Tyre; and about the same time intrigues against Bishop Ibas began at Edessa in which Eutyches had a hand. Both parties now felt that the decisive conflict was approaching. Domnus showed no signs of recognizing the deposition of Ibas, and maintained a close alliance with Theodoret, who had just before thrown down the gauntlet to the Alexandrian party in his *Eranistes;* and certain clerics from Edessa who had come to Antioch with charges against their bishop were detained there as prisoners. On the other side Dioscurus arrogantly censured Domnus, and Eutyches invoked the aid of Leo of Rome, asserting that the Nestorian heresy was being revived. The case of Ibas was discussed by a synod at Antioch in the summer of 448; Theodoret, who seems to have come to Antioch to attend it, was ordered by the emperor to return to his diocese and remain there. Possibly to the late summer belongs the unsuccessful attempt of Domnus to discredit Eutyches as an Apollinarian heretic. Probably through court influence, Irenæus was replaced in September by Photius, who at once came out on the Alexandrian side. The accusers of Ibas, who had now gone on to Constantinople, had better success there than at Antioch; they obtained a decree from the emperor calling for a rehearing of their case before three bishops, two of whom at least were known as antagonists of Ibas. All seemed to be going well for Dioscurus when a renewed accusation against Eutyches provoked him to attempt to reap his harvest before it was ripe. This new charge was nominally brought by Bishop Eusebius of Dorylæum, who, from what is known, seems to have had little sympathy with the Antioch party, though he was not an avowed adherent of the other side. To his moderate views some thoughtless expressions of Eutyches on a point of dogma may have seemed dangerous, and it is possible that personal dislike helped to determine his attitude—at least Eutyches asserted afterward that Eusebius had long been his enemy.

2. The Beginning of Strife.

However that may be, he appeared at a local synod held by Flavian of Constantinople in Nov., 448, with a charge against Eutyches which named him in general terms as a heretic. Eusebius succeeded in forcing the synod to summon Eutyches before it. He returned answer that he was unwilling to leave his monastery; that he adhered to the decrees of Nicæa and Ephesus; but that he declined to be bound by expressions taken at random from the Fathers, preferring to follow the Scripture, which was a more certain rule of faith than all of them. He denied ever having taught that the Divine Word had brought his body with him from heaven; he acknowledged "one nature of God made flesh," and that Christ was at once perfect God and perfect man, though his body was not *homoousios* with ours. The synod now sent a more formal summons to Eutyches, which had to be twice repeated before, on Nov. 22, he at last appeared, escorted by a military guard and a large number of monks. His heterodoxy was not long in manifesting itself to the assembly. Attempts were made to find a way out of the difficulty, and for a moment he seemed to yield; but his settled conviction was expressed in the words "I confess that our Lord was born of two natures before the union." The council found Apollinarianism and Valentinianism in his admission, deposed him from his priestly and monastic offices, and excommunicated him. This condemnation, of course, did not touch the Christology of Cyril himself; but many of the Alexandrians thought as Eutyches did. The blow was thus a heavy one for them and there is no doubt that it was the cause of the energetic counterstroke represented by the Synod of Ephesus in 449. Of the intervening events it is known only that Eutyches attempted to set aside the condemnation and to win to his defense a number of prominent bishops, including Leo of Rome and Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna, and probably Dioscurus and others in the East; that he made the most of his favor at court; and that he asserted a falsification of the acts of the Constantinopolitan synod and induced the emperor to order an investigation of his charge. Flavian, who was forced to satisfy the emperor of his orthodoxy by a special confession of faith, also sought help abroad, and Leo of Rome took a decisive stand on his side in a brief of May 21, 449.

3. The Robber Synod of Ephesus, 449.

The discontent of the Alexandrians, however, was so decided that they induced the emperor to call a new ecumenical council at Ephesus for Aug. 1, of the same year. Everything was prepared for a triumph of Dioscurus, whom the emperor designated to preside over the council; but the completeness of his triumph was impaired by Pope Leo, who developed in a famous letter to Flavian of June 13, sent by his legates with another to the council, the Western doctrine of the two natures in its essential variation from the Alexandrian with a clearness that was fatal to the permanent maintenance of the latter. The number of participants in the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus was never higher than 138. Two imperial commissaries were present; Eusebius of Dorylæum and Flavian of Constantinople found themselves placed by the emperor himself in the position of accused parties, while Eutyches was summoned almost as accuser. The first period of the synod's session, Aug. 8–18, was occupied with the rehabilitation of Eutyches and the deposition of Eusebius and Flavian. Among the tolerably certain facts are the unsuccessful demand of the Roman legates to be allowed to preside, and their failure to have the epistle of Leo to Flavian even read; their repeated protests against this so-called invasion of the rights of the Roman see; and the unsparingly masterful manner in which Dioscurus conducted the whole affair. The tumultuous scene described by Gibbon, which had given its opprobrious name to the synod, rests upon partizan accounts and can be shown inaccurate in detail. The proceedings of the second period, Aug. 20–22 (?) from which not only Eusebius and Flavian but also the Roman legates were absent, resulted in a number of depositions. Among others Ibas, Irenæus of Tyre, Theodoret, and even Domnus of Antioch were deposed and excommunicated as Nestorians.

The decision of the synod was received with approval at court, but by no means wholly so throughout the East. Yet Dioscurus had on his side, besides court favor, the sympathies of most of the Eastern bishops, and Flavian's place at Constantinople was soon taken by Anatolius, an Alexandrian partizan. The only hope for a revision of the settlement lay in the West, whither Theodoret and Flavian now turned. But for the moment even the influence of Rome was unavailing. The synod in Rome on Oct. 15, 449, rejected the decrees of Ephesus, and Leo attempted in vain, through his own letters and those of the Western emperor to procure from Theodosius II. the calling of a new synod in Italy. The death of Theodosius in the next year brought about great changes. The power was now in the hands of Pulcheria, who had already been won over to Leo's side. Anatolius held a synod the same autumn at Constantinople which declared its agreement with Leo's epistle to Flavian, which had already found increasing assent in the East. Leo was not able, however, to secure that the new general council should be held in the West; and it finally sat at Chalcedon, across the Bosphorus from Constantinople, Oct. 8 to Nov. 1, 451, attended by about 600 bishops. The presidency, in a parliamentary sense, was held by the imperial commissaries; but the papal legates, recognized by the council as representing the spiritual head of the Church, took the lead among the ecclesiastics and presided formally when the imperial commissaries were absent.

4. The Council of Chalcedon, 451.

Dioscurus had secured his triumph at Ephesus largely through the strength of his Egyptian following; the emperor guarded against a repetition of this by ordering him to come alone to Constantinople. He had a private audience with the new emperor, Marcian, Pulcheria's husband, in the presence of Anatolius and others, which was intended to bring him to an accommodation—but without success. He soon recognized that the cause was

lost; and his downfall was not long in following. He appeared in the council practically as an accused person, while Theodoret, whom he had deposed at Ephesus, took his seat under the full protection of both pope and emperor. At the close of the first session the commissaries declared that Dioscurus himself and five of his principal supporters at Ephesus must be deposed, which took place in the third session, though a direct charge of heresy was avoided. He was banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in 454. The five other bishops were restored to good standing in the fourth session. As to the dogmatic question, which the council treated with some hesitation, nominally out of respect for the First Council of Ephesus, after two epistles of Cyril (iv. and xxxix.) and Leo's to Flavian had been acknowledged, Anatolius was directed to draw up a proposed new definition. This, which was apparently decided in its expressions on the point of one person out of two natures, was approved by the majority at the fifth session; but the Roman legates threatened to take their departure and have a new council called in Italy if Leo's epistle was not closely followed. The majority was disinclined to yield until an imperial order forced them to appoint a new committee on definition, of which the legates were now members. The result of this work was laid before the council at the same session, and solemnly proclaimed, Oct. 25. This was from the dogmatic standpoint a complete victory of West over East; the council's definition is only intelligible in the light of Western Christology. After an introduction affirming the Nicene and so-called Constantinopolitan creeds, which it declares sufficient as general creeds, it proceeds, with the purpose of avoiding Nestorian and Monophysite perversions of the mystery of the Incarnation, to recognize the epistles of Cyril and Leo named above as orthodox expositions of the creed, and then to give a lengthy and precise restatement of the one person of the Lord in two natures. It is not difficult to see that the terms of this definition and the recognition of Leo's epistles go beyond Cyril's teaching; but the members of the council attempted to forestall objections by persuading themselves of their agreement with both, and of each with the other. The formulas of Chalcedon were acceptable to Western minds, with their firm hold on the single person of the historic Christ without danger of obscuring either of the two natures, the divine or the human. But it was not a real settlement of the question for the East, and the action of the council, for all its pacific intent, was but the beginning of new strife (see Monophysites). Eutyches, the nominal originator of the controversy, was not expressly anathematized at Chalcedon; he was considered to have been already sufficiently condemned by Flavian, by Leo, and by the synod held under Anatolius. But after the council two imperial edicts of the year 452 enforced the ecclesiastical condemnation of his party by the usual civil penalties. Eutyches himself was banished, and the last heard of him is in a letter of Leo, Apr. 15, 454, requesting his removal to a more distant place on the ground that he still continued to deceive the unwary in his original place of banishment. See Christology, IV (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: Sources for a history are the Acts of the Synods, printed in Mansi, *Concilia*, vols. v.–vii., cf. ix. 659–702 (a summary of the whole affair in vii. 1060 sqq.); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 317 sqq., Eng. transl., iii. 186 sqq.; S. G. F. Perry, *Second Synod of Ephesus*, Acts, Dartford, 1881 (with Syriac text and sources); Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, passim, Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. iii.; idem, *Eranistes*, in his *Opera*, ed. Schulze, vol. iv., Halle, 1774; Gelasius, *Gesta de nomine Acacii*, ed. Thiel, *Epistolæ Romanorum pontificum*, i. 510–519, Braunsberg, 1868; G. Hoffmann, in *Schriften der Universität zu Kiel*, vol. xx., 1873.

Consult Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xv. 479–719; W. A. Arendt, *Leo der Grosse*, Mainz, 1835; E. Perthel, *Papst Leo's I. Leben und Lehren*, Jena, 1843; Wm. Bright, *Hist. of the Church*, pp. 313–451, Oxford, 1860; I. A. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, II., i.–ii., Edinburgh, 1862; W Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, i. 311–315, ib. 1863; P. Martin, *Le Pseudo-Synode . . d'Éphèse*, Paris, 1875; A. Ehrhard, in *TQ*, lxx (1888), 179–243, 406–450, 623–653; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 560–569; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 734–740; Moeller, *Christian Church*, i. 419–422; Harnack, *Dogma*, iv. 197 sqq.; *DCB*, ii. 404–412 (very full).

EUTYCHIANUS, yū-tik'ī-ā''nus: Pope 275–283. His name occurs in the lists of bishops of Rome between Felix and Caius, and a pontificate of eight years, nine months, and three days is assigned to him. Nothing at all is known of the events which marked it; but it may be mentioned that the tablet which covered his grave in the so-called "vault of the popes" has been discovered (cf. F. X. Kraus, *Roma sotterranea*, Freiburg, 1879, 154). (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Mommsen in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 38; Bower, *Popes*, i. 37–38.

EUTYCHIUS OF ALEXANDRIA (also known by the Arabic name *Sa'id ibn Baṭrik*): Melchite patriarch of Alexandria Feb. 7, 933 to May 11, 940; b. in Fostat (the modern Cairo) 876; d. 940. Before entering upon the clerical estate he had been a physician, and had also pursued historical studies. As patriarch, he had to endure severe conflicts with the Jacobite Copts. His writings in Arabic, only in part preserved, are of medical, theological, and historical content. His principal work is the "String of Pearls" (Arab. *Nazm al-jawahir*), i.e., "Compend of History." It is a narrative from the creation of the world to 938, and comprises Biblical, profane, and ecclesiastical history. It contains many remarkable data, otherwise unknown, and valuable contributions to the history of Nestorianism and Monophysitism. The edition of Edward Pococke (2 vols., Oxford, 1654–56), is reprinted in *MPG*, cxi. 889–1232; and in 1906 a new edition by L. Cheikho, in Arabic and Latin, was begun in the *Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium* (Paris). G. Krüger.

Bibliography: E. Renaudot, *Historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum*, pp. 346 sqq., Paris, 1713; F. Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der arabischen Aerzte*, p. 52, Göttingen, 1840; A. von Gutschmid, in *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 399–400, 486, Leipsic, 1890; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiii. 45–46.

EUTYCHIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE: Patriarch of Constantinople; b. in Phrygia c. 512; d. Apr. 5, 582. He became monk and abbot at Amasia in Pontus, and in 552 went to Constantinople as his bishop's ambassador. Here he so effectually combated the Antiochian theology, and made

such an impression on the emperor Justinian that the latter, upon the death of the patriarch Mennas (Aug., 552), appointed him patriarch of Constantinople. He played a great part in the Three Chapter controversy (q.v.); presided at the Fifth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople, 553); conducted the consecration ceremonies for St. Sophia (562); but finally fell into disfavor with the emperor, whose aphthartodocetic [maintenance of perpetual virginity of Mary and denial of the reality of the human birth of Jesus] leanings he was unwilling to tolerate; and on Jan. 22, or Apr. 12, 565, he was exiled to his former cloister. He was thence recalled by Justin II., in 577, as successor to the patriarch John III. Scholasticus. He is honored by the Church as a saint. Of his writings, only fragments of a sermon on the Eucharist are preserved (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 2, pp. 2392–2401), in which the Greek Fathers' symbolic-dynamic view of the Eucharist reached its climax. His intimate friend the presbyter Eustratius, wrote his biography (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 2, pp. 2273–2390). G. Krüger.

Bibliography: *ASB*, Apr., i. 548; Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.*; John of Ephesus, *Eccl. Hist.*, third part, ed. W. Cureton, Oxford, 1853; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 352–356; *DCB*, ii. 414–416.

EVAGRIUS, ī″vā-grī′us, **PONTICUS:** Nitrian hermit; b. at Ibora, a small town of Pontus, near the capital Amasia, year unknown; d. after 400. He was the son of a presbyter in Ibora. Basil the Great appointed him lector, and Gregory Nazianzen made him deacon. When Gregory left Constantinople (381?), Evagrius remained in the capital under his successor Nestorius. Because of a love affair with a noble lady he went to Jerusalem where he entered the circle of Melania, the friend of Rufinus (q.v.), and was sent by her to Egypt into the Nitrian desert to recover from serious illness, probably acute mental depression induced by his experiences. There he spent two years on the *mons Nitriæ*, then fourteen years in the colony of hermits called *Kellia*, earning his living by penmanship. His works are all monastic. Definite criticism of them is as yet impossible since the Greek writings published under his name are at best only excerpts. Gennadius (*De vir. ill.*, xi.) gives a list of them: (1) "Suggestions against the Eight Principal Sins" in eight books, essentially a compilation of Bible texts intended to work like amulets against certain sinful thoughts. (2) A collection of "One Hundred Sentiments" for uneducated anchorites, and one of "Fifty Sentiments" for educated anchorites. (3) A guide to the common life for monks. (4) A writing dedicated to a nun. (5) "Opinions" for monks, which Gennadius pronounces "very obscure." These works may be identified with five mentioned by Socrates (*Hist. eccl.*, iv. 23). The doctrine of Evagrius can not be judged on the basis of the existing material. Connections with the Cappadocians [Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa] are probable not only on account of a passage quoted by Socrates but also because of the whole course of his education. He belonged to that small number of practical ascetics who as educated men were able to indicate monasticism and asceticism philosophically, hence the reputation which he enjoyed in the desert among the colonies of ascetics who were mostly uneducated men. His predilection for Origen became fatal to him. In the later Origenistic controversies the doctrine of Evagrius was condemned, and from the seventh century his name with that of Origen and Didymus is placed among the archheretics. (Erwin Preuschen.)

Bibliography: The best collection (far from complete) of his writings is in Gallandi, *Bibliotheca*, vii. 551–581, reprinted in *MPG*, xl. On his Syriac works consult W. Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum*, London, 1870–72. On his life and work: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, 2d ed., x. 368 sqq.; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix. 284, Hamburg, 1804; E. Nestle, in *ZDMG*, 1878, pp. 465 sqq.; O. Zöckler, *Evagrius Ponticus*, Munich, 1893; idem, *Askese und Mönchtum*, i. 253 sqq., Frankfort, 1897; J. A. Robinson, in *TS*, iii. 3 (1895).

EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS: Early church historian; b. at Epiphania, Cœle-Syria, c. 536; d. after 594. He received careful training in the schools of the grammarians and rhetoricians and settled in Antioch as a lawyer (hence his surname, Scholasticus). Here he assisted the patriarch Gregorius (569–594) in drafting briefs, reports, and decrees, and successfully defended him at Constantinople (589) when he was arraigned on the charge of grievous persecutions. From the Emperor Tiberius he obtained the rank of a quæstor; from Mauricius, that of a prefect. He is known chiefly for his "Ecclesiastical History," in six books, which is a continuation of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, extending from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the twelfth year of the reign of Mauricius (593–594). It is one of the chief sources, especially for the history of contemporary theological controversies, though it also takes account of the wars with the Persians and other barbarians, and, like other Byzantine chronicles, contains notices of all sorts of remarkable events (calamities, conflagrations, earthquakes, etc.). Evagrius made good use of his original sources (Eustathius of Antioch, Procopius of Cæsarea, John Malala, John of Epiphania, Menander Protector, Zacharias Rhetor and others), and his judgment is discreet and impartial. Ecclesiastically orthodox, he strictly abides by the synodical decisions, and censures, in particular, every deviation from the Chalcedonian dogma. Even his great predecessor, Eusebius, is not quite proof against his criticism; though Evagrius concedes that Eusebius led his readers close to the true faith, even if he did not teach them strict orthodoxy. The best edition of the history is that of J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius, with the Scholia* (London, 1898); Eng. transl. in *Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library* in the volume with Theodoret (London, 1854). G. Krüger.

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix. 284 sqq., Hamburg, 1904; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 415–416; *DCB*, ii. 423–424; C. de Boor, in *ZKG*, v (1881), 315–322, vi (1883), 482 sqq.

EVANGELIARIUM (i.e., *evangeliarium volumen*, "Gospel book"; *evangeliarius*, with *liber* or *codex* understood, is found more rarely): A book containing the appointed Gospel lections for church service. The collecting of the Gospel writings

under the name *euangelion* dates back to the earliest age of the Church (cf. Zahn, *Kanon*, i. 161 sqq.). At first separate rolls (*volumina*) were united; then *codices* (manuscripts in which the leaves lay consecutively like a modern book) were made. This form coincides with the traditional history of the New Testament and sacred Scriptures generally, during the first centuries (cf. Victor Schultze, *Rolle und Codex*, in *Greifswalder Studien*, Gütersloh, 1895, pp. 149 sqq.). The subsequent rise of the Pericopes (q.v.) from the fourth century on led either to the attachment of an appendix to the Gospel book, in which the canonical lections were tabulated (*lectionarium*, *euangelistarion*, in the narrower sense), or to the formation of a new book, whose contents were exclusively the prescribed Gospel lections. The usual designation for such a book in the West came to be *evangeliarium*, in the East, *euangelistarion* (in the wider sense). Combined with the *epistolare* (i.e., *epistolare volumen*, "the Epistle [book]," Gk. *apostolos*, *praxapostolos*, "the Apostle"), which grew out of a similar process, and contained the remaining portion of the New Testament, the *evangeliarium* constituted the *lectionarium* or *lectionarius* (in the wider sense; Gk. *anagnōstikon* [*biblion*], *biblion apostolikon*).

Even as early as in the fourth century, the religious and ecclesiastical appreciation of the evangeliarium rose to such a degree that people regarded the same as typifying Scripture generally. Thus it was used in the administration of oaths, and it gained an established place in the ceremony of ordination, being either solemnly delivered to the candidate for orders, or held over his head during the act of blessing. Copies written in small script were worn by women and boys as a charm about the neck. It was applied to the relief of the sick, and ecclesiastical ordinances insured for it the same veneration as was accorded to sacred images. In public worship, in processions and other ecclesiastical observances, reverence was shown toward it in various ways.

This being the popular state of mind, the zealous cooperation of art is a matter of course. Beginning even in the fourth century, covers ornamented with costly stones and ivory carvings (cf. Victor Schultze, *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst*, Munich, 1895, pp. 258 sqq.), purple parchment, gilt and silver script, and miniature painting, come into vogue on a scale of lavish luxury. The Carolingian era continued the practise, and it was tenaciously conserved by the medieval era proper. Ivory carving, enameling, and other fine arts were more and more extensively brought into requisition; and along with descriptive illustration, there is developed the art of initial painting, while marginal decoration reaches its highest perfection during the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance (cf. H. Otte, *Kunstarchäologie des deutschen Mittelalters*, i., Leipsic, 1883, pp. 171 sqq.; F. X. Kraus, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1896–1900). Embroidered cloths (*camisiæ evangeliorum*), or artistic cases (*capsæ*), served as protection against wear. Thus the history of the Gospel text is closely connected with religious and ecclesiastical customs and with the history of art. VICTOR SCHULTZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the literature mentioned in the text: C. R. Gregory, *Prolegomena*, ii. 687–777, Leipsic, 1890; *DCA*, i. 740–745, ii. 953–967, 1006–15, and the literature under BIBLE TEXT, II.

EVANGELICAL ADVENTISTS. See ADVENTISTS, 1.

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

Foundation and Constitution (§ 1).
Branch Alliances (§ 2).
The Week of Prayer (§ 3).
Conferences, National and General (§ 4).
Appeals for Religious Liberty (§ 5).

The Evangelical Alliance is a voluntary association of Evangelical Christians of different churches and countries to manifest and promote the union of Christian believers and advance the cause of religious liberty. It was founded, after several preparatory meetings and conferences, especially one at Liverpool in 1845, in an enthusiastic gathering held in Freemason's Hall in London, Aug. 19–23, 1846. Eight hundred Christians were present—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, and others,—including, from Great Britain, Edward Bickersteth and Lord Wriothesley Russell (Anglican), Jabez Bunting and William Arthur (Wesleyan), Drs. Chalmers, Candlish, Norman McLeod, and Thomas Guthrie (Presbyterian), Drs. Steane, and Baptist W Noel (Baptist), Thomas Binney, John Angell James, and Dr. Leifchild (Independent); from France, Adolphe Monod and G. Fisch; from Germany F. W Krummacher and Prof. Tholuck; from Switzerland, Prof. La Harpe; and from the United States, Samuel H. Cox and William Patton. Sir Culling E. Eardly presided, and became the first president of the British branch. Nine doctrinal articles were adopted, as follows:

1. Foundation and Constitution.

1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.
2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.
3. The Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the Persons therein.
4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the Fall.
5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.
6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.
7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.
8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked.
9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

These articles were not intended to be a binding creed or confession, but simply as expression of the essential agreement of Evangelical Christians whom it seemed desirable to embrace in the Alliance. Some have regarded the statement as too liberal, others as too narrow (art. 9 excluding the Quakers), while still others would have preferred no doctrinal statement, or at best only the Apostles' Creed. The American branch, at its organization (1867; see below, § 2), adopted the nine London

articles, with the following explanatory and qualifying preamble:

Resolved, That in forming an Evangelical Alliance for the United States in cooperative union with other branches of the Alliance, we have no intention to give rise to a new denomination; or to effect an amalgamation of Churches, except in the way of facilitating personal Christian intercourse and a mutual good understanding; or to interfere in any way whatever with the internal affairs of the various denominations; but simply to bring individual Christians into closer fellowship and cooperation, on the basis of the spiritual union which already exists in the vital relation of Christ to the members of his body in all ages and countries.

Resolved, That in the same spirit we propose no new creed, but taking broad, historical, and Evangelical catholic ground, we solemnly reaffirm and profess our faith in all the doctrines of the inspired word of God, and in the *consensus* of doctrines as held by all true Christians from the beginning. And we do more especially affirm our belief in the *divine-human person and atoning work of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ* as the only and sufficient source of salvation, as the heart and soul of Christianity, and as the center of all true Christian union and fellowship.

Resolved, That, with this explanation, and in the spirit of a just Christian liberality in regard to the minor differences of theological schools and religious denominations, we also adopt, as a summary of the *consensus* of the various Evangelical Confessions of Faith, the Articles and Explanatory Statement set forth and agreed on by the Evangelical Alliance at its formation in London, 1846, and approved by the separate European organizations.

2. Branch Alliances. Branch Alliances have been formed in Great Britain, Germany, France, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Greece, and among the missionaries in Turkey, Egypt, and India; also in the United States, Canada, Australia, Brazil, Mexico, and among the Protestant missionaries in Japan and China. There is no central organization with controlling authority; and the General Alliance appears in active operation only as it has met in its general conferences (see below, § 4). The various national branches are related to each other as members of a confederation with equal rights. The British organization, being the oldest and largest, and having a house and salaried officers who devote their whole time to the work, has been the most influential; the Continental branches are more elastic, and confine themselves to occasional work. The "Evangelical Alliance for the United States" or the American branch, was organized at the Bible House, New York, Jan. 30, 1867 (a previous attempt having failed on account of the antislavery agitation before the Civil War), with William E. Dodge as president. Its first official communication was made to the Fifth General Conference of the Alliance, meeting at Amsterdam, Aug., 1867, and was a report on the "State of Religion in the United States of America" prepared by Prof. Henry B. Smith, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, chairman of the executive committee of the American branch. Mr. Dodge remained president till his death (1883) when he was succeeded by his son William E. Dodge, Jr. Drs. S. Irenæus Prime and Philip Schaff were the first corresponding secretaries. The American branch at once became a vigorous organization and presented an invitation to the Alliance in session in Amsterdam to hold its next meeting (1873) in New York, which was accepted.

The Alliance has sought to accomplish its work in three ways,—by means of the annual Week of Prayer, by conferences and by appeals for those oppressed by religious persecution. At a conference at Manchester, 1846, a resolution was adopted urging the "members and friends of the Alliance throughout the world to observe the week beginning with the first Lord's day of January in each year as a season for concert in prayer on behalf of the objects contemplated by the Alliance." Later the scope was widened in answer to an appeal from the English and American missionaries in India. It has become a fruitful means for promoting Christian union and the spread of the Gospel at home and abroad. A program is issued several months in advance of the date by the British organization, and sent to the branch Alliances for their revision and adoption. Each branch adapts it to the conditions and wants of the country which it represents, and gives it publicity. Fifty-nine programs have thus far been issued. In more recent years the American branch has acted independently in preparing a program of its own. The subjects chosen for prayer have included union with Christ, home and foreign missions, the nations and their rulers, the home, and Christian institutions such as the Young Men's Christian Association, schools and Sunday Schools.

3. The Week of Prayer.

The British organization from the beginning has held an annual conference in October in some city of England. The American branch has held conferences in Pittsburg 1875, Detroit 1877, St. Louis 1879, Washington 1887, Boston 1889, and at Chicago in connection with the Columbian Exposition 1893. The German branch has held national conferences at Berlin 1894, Cassel 1896, Essen 1898, Heidelberg 1900, and Hamburg 1905. It is managed by a committee of twelve, one of whom represents the Methodists in Germany. The Continental and other branches meet less regularly. Far more important, however, are the General Conferences convened at intervals according to circumstances. They have an international as well as interdenominational character, and may be called Protestant ecumenical councils, with the important difference that they do not settle dogmas or canons of discipline, and claim no legislative authority. They have been held in the great capitals, and arranged by the branch in whose bounds they meet, with the cooperation of all the sister branches. They last from seven to ten days, and are spent in prayer and praise, brotherly communion, and free discussions of the leading religious and social questions of the age. Eleven International Conferences have been held in the following cities: London in 1851, the year of the first great International Exhibition; Paris, 1855; Berlin, 1857; Geneva, 1861; Amsterdam, 1867; New York, 1873; Basel, 1879; Copenhagen, 1884; Florence, 1891; London, 1896—the diamond jubilee—and 1907

4. Conferences, National and General.

The Conference held in New York Oct. 2–12, 1873, drew together in friendly conference and communion representative Christians from many parts of Europe and from Asia and Africa, as well as from all parts of the United

States and Canada. Dr. Philip Schaff made four journeys abroad to awaken interest in the gathering and to invite chosen speakers. He presented the matter before church diets including the Old Catholic Congress, before the faculties of universities and selected groups of clergymen, also in audiences with the German Emperor and Mr. Gladstone. Among the more eminent speakers from abroad, all clergymen and doctors of divinity, unless otherwise stated, were Joseph Angus (Baptist), R. Payne Smith, W H. Freemantle, Stanley Leathes, and Rev. C. D. Marston (Anglican), John Stoughton and Joseph Parker (Independent), Wm. Arnot, John Cairns, and Robert Knox (Presbyterian), all of Great Britain; Georges Fisch, E. F. Cook and T. Lorriaux of France; I. A. Dorner, Theodor Christlieb and W Krafft of Germany; Profs. C. Pronier and J. F. Astié and Franck Coulin of Switzerland; Cohen Stuart from Holland; Prof. M. Prochet from Florence; M. Kalopothakes, M.D., from Greece; and Revs. Antonio Carrasco and Fritz Fliedner from Spain. The Rev. Narayan Sheshadri, a converted Brahman of high caste, was one of the most interesting figures of the conference.

The seventh conference (Basel, 1879) was not so large and imposing. The eighth conference (Copenhagen, 1884) took the alliance to distinctly Lutheran ground and brought the strict Scandinavian Protestantism into fellowship with the churches of other lands. The conference at Florence (1891) gave an impulse to Italian evangelization. The tenth conference (London, 1896) was a jubilee meeting commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Alliance.

5. Appeals for Religious Liberty.

The Alliance has appealed against religious persecution in a number of instances through the press and deputations of influential public men, and while the appeals have not always accomplished their immediate purpose, they have had a considerable moral influence in favor of a more general adoption of the principles of religious liberty. It successfully exerted its influence for the release of the Madiai family in Florence, 1852, who were punished for reading the Bible and holding religious meetings; for the release of Matamoras, Carrasco, and their friends, who, during the reign of Queen Isabella in Spain, were thrown into prison and condemned to the galleys for the same cause, 1863. It aided in inducing the sultan of Turkey to abolish the death-penalty for apostasy from Mohammedanism in his dominions after the Crimean War, 1856. It interceded for the Methodists and Baptists in Sweden, 1858, which country has since abrogated the penal laws against Roman Catholics and Protestants not belonging to the Lutheran Confession. It sent in 1871 a large deputation to the Czar of Russia (then at Friedrichshafen) to plead for the oppressed Lutherans in the Baltic Provinces. Among the delegates from the United States were Philip Schaff and William Adams of New York, Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio, and the laymen William E. Dodge, Cyrus Field, and Nathan Bishop. It sent a similar deputation to the embassy from Japan, on its visit to the United States and the courts of Europe in 1872, to remonstrate against the persecutions of Christians, mostly Roman Catholics, in Japan. It has not forgotten the Nestorians in Persia, who appealed to the Alliance for protection against the oppression of a Mohammedan government. It prepared a memorial to the Czar on the persecution of Baptists in Southern Russia, 1874. At the seventh General Conference a deputation was appointed to wait on the Emperor of Austria in behalf of certain Christians in Bohemia, who were debarred the liberty of holding even family worship; and the request was granted by the special interposition of the emperor. In the last few years efforts have been made to secure a more enlightened and humane treatment of the Stundists in Russia and the Armenian Christians in Asia.

A new kind of work has been undertaken by the British and German branches in cooperating in the maintenance since 1905 of an Alliance School at Steglitz near Berlin to train students for religious work in Russia. (PHILIP SCHAFF†) D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Proceedings of the Liverpool meeting of 1845 and of the General Conferences at London, Paris, Berlin, Geneva, Amsterdam, New York, Basel, Florence, and the London jubilee conference of 1896, were all published in English, most of them also in French, German, and Dutch, in the cities where they were held. Of these publications especially valuable are the volumes relating to the Conference at Amsterdam by Rev. P. Steane, those at New York (1873 and 1884) by Schaff and S. I. Prime, that at Basel by J. Murray Mitchell, at Florence by R. A. Bedford, and at London by A. J. Arnold, and of the Washington, Boston and Chicago meetings. Among publications of the American branch are its *Reports*, 1867–1905, the *Narrative of the State of Religion in the United States* by Prof. H. B. Smith, presented to the Amsterdam Conference, 1867, the similar *Narrative* presented by Philip Schaff to the Basel Conference, a *Report on the Alliance Deputation to the Czar of Russia*, 1871, and the *Reunion of Christendom* by Philip Schaff, 1893, the author's last literary work. The British branch publishes yearly *Reports*, a monthly periodical, *Evangelical Christendom*, 1847–99, *The Evangelical Alliance Quarterly*, 1899–1906, and the bimonthly *Evangelical Christendom*, 1906 sqq. For brief but somewhat unsatisfactory historic accounts of the Alliance consult Rev. James Davis in the *Proceedings* for 1874, and A. J. Arnold, in the Jubilee volume, London, 1897. Consult also *Life of Philip Schaff*, N. Y., 1897, pp. 252–274, 332 sqq., 340 sqq. The President and Corresponding Secretary of the American branch is Rev. Leander Chamberlain, D.D., The Chelsea, W. 23d St., New York. The office of the British branch is 7 Adam St., Strand, London, and its secretary is H. Martyn Gooch.

EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION: An ecclesiastical body which originated as a result of the evangelistic labors of Jacob Albright (q.v.), who began preaching in 1796 among the Germans in Eastern Pennsylvania. The first organizations among his converts were formed in 1800. The first general meeting took place in 1803, which acknowledged Albright as a minister of the Gospel, and solemnly ordained him by the laying on of hands, in accordance with the precedent in Acts xiii. 1–3. Albright was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with whose doctrine, polity, and spirit he was fully in accord. But he was compelled to organize, much against his own purpose and will, because the leaders of the Methodist Church did not wish to do work at that time among the Germans of this country. In 1807 the first regular conference was held, in Kleinfeltersville, Pa., composed of the ministers and officers of the Church, twenty-eight in number. Albright was elected bishop and authorized to compile a Scriptural creed and a plan of organization, but he died May 18, 1808, leaving this work unfinished. George Miller, an excellent writer, John Walter, an eloquent preacher, and John Dreisbach, a man of uncommon gifts of organization and leadership, carried the work forward. In 1809 a second conference was held, at which the book of discipline begun by Albright and completed by George Miller, was adopted and the name, "The So-called Albright People," was

agreed upon. In 1816 the first delegated General Conference was held, at which the name, "The Evangelical Association," was adopted. A publishing house which had been founded by John Dreisbach in New Berlin, Penn., was made an institution of the Church. The work of the denomination was at first exclusively German. But it gradually turned into English, while now it labors in a number of languages and nationalities.

The Evangelical Association is Arminian in doctrine, connectional in organization, and episcopal in government. The governing bodies are: (1) The Quarterly Conference, composed of the ministers and lay officers of a charge and presided over by the presiding elder of the district. It meets four times a year, manages the affairs of the charge and recommends candidates for the ministry. (2) The Annual Conference, which has administrative jurisdiction over a prescribed territory. At its sessions a bishop presides and assigns the preachers to their charges. It licenses and ordains preachers and acts coordinately with the General Conference in the enactment of constitutional law. (3) The General Conference, meeting every four years, and consisting of the bishops, general officers, ministerial delegates chosen by the Annual Conferences upon a basis of one to every fourteen members, and lay delegates to constitute about one-third of the entire body. This is the supreme governing, legislating, and judicial body of the Church. It makes laws in concurrence with the members of the Annual Conferences, elects the bishops and general officers, and is the final court of appeal.

A controversy of several years' duration led to the secession of about 50,000 members and the organization of the United Evangelical Church (q.v.) in 1891. The Evangelical Association in 1907 consisted of twenty-seven Annual Conferences, twenty-two in the United States, one in Canada, two in Germany, one in Switzerland, and one in Japan. It has 131,437 members; 1,587 ministers, itinerant and local; 2,232 Sunday-schools with 23,977 officers and teachers and 165,192 scholars; 1,201 Young People's Alliances with 39,143 members; 2,219 organized congregations; 1,854 church edifices with an estimated value of $6,340,966; 722 parsonages valued at $1,264,618. Its total property is valued at $7,942,740.03. Its people contributed $250,000 for missions and $1,476,771 for all purposes in 1906. It has a publishing house in Cleveland, Ohio, and a branch in Stuttgart, Germany Its educational institutions are North Western College, Naperville, Ill., with four buildings, an endowment of $250,000, twenty-five professors, and 450 students; Union Biblical Institute, at the same place, with an endowment of $50,000, and forty students; Schuylkill Seminary, Reading, Penn., with $50,000 endowment; the Preachers' Seminary in Reutlingen, Germany; and the Correspondence College with headquarters at Reading, Penn. It has an orphan home at Flat Rock, Ohio, taking care of 150 children, three old people's homes, one in Philadelphia, one near Buffalo, N. Y., and one in Chicago, and a deaconesses' home and hospital in Chicago. It has missions in Japan and China. *Der christliche Botschafter*, *Th Evangelical Messenger*, *Das evangelische Magazin*, and *The Living Epistle*, all published in Cleveland, Ohio, are the church periodicals. S. P. Spreng.

Bibliography: R. Yeakel, *Jacob Albright and his Colaborers*, Cleveland, Ohio, 1883; idem, *History of the Evangelical Association*, 2 vols., ib. 1892-94 (comes down to 1850); idem, *The Life of Bishop Joseph Long*, ib. 1898; W W. Orwig, *History of the Evangelical Association*, ib. 1858; S. C. Breyfogel, *Landmarks of the Evangelical Association*, ib. 1887; S. P. Spreng, *Life and Labors of Bishop John Seybert*, ib. 1888; idem, in *American Church History Series*, xii. 383 sqq., New York, 1894; A. Stapleton, *Annals of the Evangelical Association of North America and History of the United Evangelical Church*, Harrisburg, 1896; the *Discipline of the Evangelical Association*, editions from 1809–1903.

EVANGELICAL COUNSELS. See Consilia Evangelica.

EVANGELICAL SOCIETY OF GENEVA (SOCIÉTÉ ÉVANGÉLIQUE DE GENÈVE): The oldest of the Continental Evangelical societies; founded in 1831 for the diffusion of sound doctrine throughout Switzerland and France. It has a theological school at Geneva, supports numerous missionaries, pastors, and colporteurs, and is dependent upon voluntary contributions derived not only from Switzerland, but also from other parts of Europe and even from the United States, which produce an annual income of about 260,000 francs. It is undenominational, having as its confession of faith substantially the creed of the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.). It is the product of the revival attending the labors of Robert Haldane (see Haldane, James Alexander, and Robert).

Bibliography: *Récits et souvenirs de quelques-uns des ouvriers* (published on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary, 1881); and the "Annual Reports."

EVANGELICAL UNION: 1. The Evangelical Union of Scotland: A religious body formed at Kilmarnock, Scotland, May 16, 1843, at a meeting attended by four ministers, one evangelist, and eight elders, representing three churches and two preaching stations. The ministers—James Morison of Kilmarnock, his father Robert Morison of Bathgate, John Guthrie of Kendal, and Alexander C. Rutherford of Falkirk—had been virtually expelled from the Secession Church for holding the doctrine of an unlimited atonement and protesting against the condemnation of James Morison (q.v.) by the Secession Synod. The distinctive doctrines affirmed were "the universality of the atonement, the universality and moral nature of the influences of the Holy Spirit, and the simplicity of faith, which, by means of its object, Jesus Christ, as made known in the Gospel, brings peace to the conscience and purity to the heart." The Independent ecclesiastical polity was adopted, each church to be complete in itself. The membership of the union was soon increased and an impetus was given to its work by a number of churches, ministers, and students—John Kirk, Fergus Ferguson, Peter Mather, William Bathgate, and others—who were dissociated from the Congregational Union of Scotland for holding views similar to those of James Morison (see Ferguson, Fergus). It was not intended originally to be a sect or a separate denomination,

but revival meetings held over the whole country and the wide preaching of the doctrines of the Union led to the formation of churches and this necessitated organization. A theological academy was instituted with James Morison as first professor, and John Guthrie was added as colleague in a few years; other professors were appointed later and the classes were comparatively large. The business of the Union was carried on by an Annual Conference and the committees it appointed.

The influence of the Union was far in excess of what might have been expected from its members. Ministers and laymen zealously expounded their views in opposition to the Calvinistic doctrines of the Westminster Confession, and numerous tracts, pamphlets, and books were issued from the publishing house and circulated widely. The *Christian News* (weekly) was started in 1846 and continued for sixty years. The *Evangelical Repository* (quarterly) was commenced in 1854 and continued for thirty-four years. A monthly *Forward* existed for seven years and the *Day Star* and *Dew Drop* had a large circulation for half a century. The members of the Union were among the pioneers of the temperance movement in Scotland. All of its clergy and ninety per cent of its members were total abstainers and no liquor dealer was allowed to join any of the churches. In 1896 the churches of the Union—more than ninety in number—united with the Congregational Union of Scotland, securing their historical position by a prefatory note placed at the head of the constitution of the united body which states, among other things, that they were moved and encouraged to seek union " in order to effective cooperation in extending the Kingdom of God and proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ, through whose person and work as God Incarnate, and the saving and sanctifying grace of God, the Holy Spirit, God the Father in his love has made provision for, and is seeking the salvation of all men." A few small and unimportant churches still retain the name Evangelical Union.

WILLIAM ADAMSON.

2. For the **German "Evangelical Union for the Preservation of German Protestant Interests,"** see BUND, EVANGELISCHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Ferguson, *Hist. of the Evangelical Union*, Glasgow, 1876; *Evangelical Union Jubilee*, ib. 1892; J. Ross, *Hist. of Congregational Independency in Scotland*, ib. 1900.

EVANGELIST: A word which occurs three times in the New Testament (Acts xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11; II Tim. iv. 5), not found in the Septuagint and other Greek versions, in the Apostolic Fathers, or in the *Didache*, and not in classical Greek use. It is from the same root as the words translated "Gospel" (Gk. *euangelion*) and "to preach" (*euangelizomai*). In Eph. iv. 11 evangelists are enumerated along with apostles, prophets, pastors, and teachers, but this does not mean that they were a distinct order of church officials. Deacons, presbyters, and apostles (Acts viii. 25; I Cor. i. 17; etc.), all might exercise evangelistic functions. Timothy, the bishop-presbyter, was exhorted to "do the work of an evangelist" (II Tim. iv. 5); and Philip, one of the seven deacons at Jerusalem, is called an evangelist (Acts viii. 5, xxi. 8). The evangelists are to be regarded as itinerants, traveling from place to place. This was the case with Philip, who preached in Samaria, expounded the word to the eunuch on his way to Gaza, and then labored in Cæsarea and the cities round about (Acts viii. 40). They acted independently (Acts viii. 4), but largely as "fellow laborers" and assistants of the apostles, accompanying them on their journeys, and laboring under their direction. Theodoret (*Ad Eph.* iv. 11) was the first to restrict the term to itinerant preachers, and Œcumenius applied it for the first time strictly to the authors of the Gospels. The term is used at the present time in both these senses. In later liturgical language the name was given to the reader of the Gospel for the day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: O. Zöckler, *Diakonen und Evangelisten*, Munich, 1893; T. Zahn, *Missionsmethoden im Zeitalter der Apostel*, Leipsic, 1886; J. Reville, *Les Origines de l'épiscopat*, Paris, 1889; C. von Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, 2 vols., London, 1894–95; *DB*, i. 795–797.

EVANGELIST MISSIONARY CHURCH. See METHODISTS, IV., 9.

EVANGELIZATION.

Meanings of the Term (§ 1).
Evangelization in Roman Catholic Countries (§ 2).
In Greco-Russian, Mohammedan and Heathen Lands (§ 3).
Local Societies in or beside the Churches (§ 4).
The Movement in Germany (§ 5).

Evangelization is the announcement of the divine message of salvation and consequent awakening to a saving faith (Matt. xi. 5; Acts xvi. 10, xvii. 18; Rom. x. 15; I Cor. i. 17; I Pet. i. 12). The agent is called an evangelist in the New Testament (see EVANGELIST).

1. Meanings of the Term.

In the original sense evangelization was the mission work done on the basis of the universal testimony of the faithful and in the strength of a special grace. In a narrower sense since the time of the Waldensians and John Wyclif the word is employed to express the efforts to counteract and correct the declension during the Middle Ages from apostolic ideals of Christian living. Later the content of the word came to be the efforts made in the service of the Church as one of the blessings of the Protestant Reformation to preach the pure word of grace and to stimulate to higher individual and community life and to larger activity in Christian service. Another use of the word makes it express an unofficial activity, within the Evangelical national Churches, essentially related to the work of home missions. This article will deal with evangelization in the last two senses.

Evangelization as a reform has its area of operation in lands belonging to the Roman Catholic or Greek faiths or where either by Mohammedanism or a returning heathenism the Church has been overcome. In Italy the Waldensian Church is the central agent in evangelization, possessing seventeen parishes in the home valleys, forty-four church organizations, fifty-seven mission stations, several schools, a theological seminary, a union for promoting the spiritual and temporal well-being

of scattered Waldensians, and an orphan asylum in Rome. The synod has also under its care three organizations of the Free Church in Milan, Bari, and Mottola. The Evangelical Church of Italy (formerly the Free Church) has existed since 1870 and reports twenty organizations and 119 preaching places. German Evangelical organizations are found in Venice, Milan, Florence, Naples, Genoa, Bologna, Rome (since 1820), San Remo, and elsewhere. The pastors have held since 1880 a yearly conference, and are for the most part under the direction of the Prussian Evangelical Council. The organizations in the different cities have local institutions of value, such as societies for men and for women, homes for young men, homes for the aged, for seamen, and the like. The Wesleyan Methodists have thirty-six organizations, the Methodist Episcopal Church (American) has twenty-eight, and the Old Catholic five. The British and Foreign Bible Society maintains thirty colporteurs, and the Evangelical Book and Tract Society in Italy is doing its peculiar work. In Spain and Portugal there are German Evangelical organizations in Lisbon, Barcelona, Malaga, and Amora, and the Anglican Church is represented in Madrid by a congregation having its own church. The work of the German Evangelical Church in Madrid is prospering and employing various agencies. The circulation of the Scriptures is proceeding rapidly. See ITALY; SPAIN; PORTUGAL; and for France, Belgium, Austria, and Hungary see the articles on those countries.

2. Evangelization in Roman Catholic Countries.

In Russia the work of evangelization is sternly repressed (cf. R. Krause, *Ein Stück Kirchen- und Lebensgeschichte aus den deutsch-russischen Ostseeprovinzen*, Gütersloh, 1893; H. Dalton, *Der Stundismus in Russland*, ib. 1896). In St. Petersburg the Evangelicals find more toleration and display considerable charitable activity. Pastoral work among the Lutheran communities in South Russia and the Caucasus is made difficult by the great distances. In the Balkans the Evangelical communities and interests need reenforcements. The Germans have a station at Belgrade, established in 1860, and at Sophia and Rustchuk there are also stations. Baptists have recently undertaken work in the region. In Rumania the Germans have nine stations, and in Turkey one in Constantinople and one in Salonika. In Greece since 1896 recognition has been granted to the Greek Evangelical Church. In Asia Minor, principally through American agencies, the old Armenian Church was aroused to new life. But because of this very activity and also in consequence of the reports concerning the existence of an Armenian revolutionary party, Mohammedan fanaticism has almost succeeded in annihilating the results (cf. J. Lepsius, *Armenien und Europa*, Berlin, 1896). Hope is entertained, however, that the Evangelical agencies, especially those of a charitable character will succeed in reinstating better conditions. In Palestine congregations of the German Evangelical Church are found in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Jaffa, Haifa, and Beirut. The United Brethren are also active there, while asylums, hospitals, and schools are employed effectively. Egypt is occupied by agencies from England and Germany. The Presbyterian Church and the German Evangelicals are active in Brazil and work is carried on also in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Venezuela. See the articles on the countries named.

3. In Greco-Russian, Mohammedan, and Heathen Lands.

Even within the Protestant Churches there come lapses from faith and a declension of ethical standards; new zeal then develops in the membership, and organizations outside of the regular ecclesiastical agencies, having an Evangelical character, come into existence. Out of German Pietism arose societies of a charitable sort having as their object the saving of abandoned children and the dissemination of the Scriptures and of Christian literature. Preaching by laymen of the standing of Zinzendorf, Tersteegen, Bogatzky, and M. Hahn, drawing largely from the inspiration of Reformation sources, has had a large influence upon the quickening of Christian life, and also upon the development of the "Innere Mission." English Methodism is an example of a kind of evangelization which was carried on outside the agencies regularly employed, working through such means as Sunday Schools, city missions, and itinerant preaching. Another example of the same kind is the "Innere Mission" of Germany, seconding the regular work of the established churches (see INNERE MISSION). Local societies have also engaged in special work in their own fields in Stuttgart, Basel, Baden, Elberfeld, and other places. In Norway the peasant H. N. Hague (q.v.) was instrumental in forming a society for carrying on work of this character in France, where evangelists, preachers, and colporteurs were maintained for a number of years. In Holland for fifty years the "Netherland Protestant Union" worked in concert with the Reformed Church of that country. In France the McAll Mission (q.v.) has accomplished work not merely in Paris but throughout France in stimulating the sending of preachers, Bible-women, and teachers to some fifty-seven places. The work of Moody and Sankey and of Pearsall Smith are not to be forgotten. Emulation of the Methodist methods of working aroused in Germany such men as Ziemann, Baedeker and Von Schlumbach to labors of the same kind. As a result of the appeal of Dr. Christlieb Evangelical societies were organized in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden for the appointment of lay evangelists whose work should be the stimulation of the Church to new life in the matter of saving souls. Similar results followed in Germany, and institutes for the training of men for the work were founded.

4. Local Societies in or beside the Churches.

In Germany the growing importance of this kind of labor stimulated the Central Committee of the "Innere Mission" in 1888 to take council with its friends and supporters concerning the Evangelical activity of laymen in the kingdom of God, its need, and its limitations. The conclusion was reached that, in view of the fact that large numbers of the

people are not reached by the ordinary ministrations of the Church, there is necessitated an extraordinary method not bound by the usual limitations under which ecclesiastical operations are conducted. In case ordinary methods are not suited to any particular need, the matter shall not go by default by deferring to the usual agencies. While regularly trained candidates in theology are to be kept in mind for the propagation of such work, well-equipped laymen are not to be rejected, especially if their gifts are suited for the labor. Only experience can determine whether the institutions for training evangelists are suited for the development of this kind of activity. At any rate, such institutions must be under official supervision. Evangelical operations are not, as a rule, to be regarded as anything but the response to a special need. The regular agencies of the Gospel are to be stimulated, not dwarfed into inactivity. Meanwhile the movement has been widely extended. In official gatherings of the churches the question has been discussed what should be the attitude toward the unofficial and free attempts to evangelize. The Conference of Pastors of the Lower Rhine district in 1894, the Saxon Union for the Innere Mission in 1894–95, the Sleswick-Holstein Union, the Eisenach Conference in 1896, and the General Synod of 1897 have all discussed various phases of the question. The good results often flowing from these methods of free evangelization have been recognized and the acknowledgment made that reenforcement should be added. To the officials of the Church in their own departments these recommendations have been made for appropriate action in the prosecution of their labor.

5. The Movement in Germany.

(P Rahlenbeck.)

Bibliography: J. Schneider, *Evangelisation und Gemeinschaftspflegen*, Gütersloh, 1897; R. Krause, *Ein Stück Kirchen-und Lebensgeschichte*, ib. 1893; J. Müller, *Die Evangelisation unter den Entkirchlichten*, Leipsic, 1895; H. Dalton, *Der Stundismus in Russland*, Gütersloh, 1896; J. Lepsius, *Armenien und Europa*, Berlin, 1896; O. Märker, *Die Evangelisation*, Stuttgart, 1896; E. Bunke, *Kirchliche Evangelisation*, Hamburg, 1899; T. Hardeland, *Evangelisationsfrage*, Leipsic, 1899; E. Graebenteich, *Zur Evangelisationsfrage*, Eisleben, 1900.

EVANS, CHRISTMAS: Welsh Baptist; b. at Ysgaerwen, near Llandyssil (15 m. e.s.e. of Cardigan), Dec. 25, 1766; d. at Swansea July 19, 1838. Through the death of his father, a shoemaker, he was left destitute at the age of nine. After six unhappy years spent with his mother's uncle he became a farm hand. Through the influence of David Davies, a preacher and school-teacher, he joined the Presbyterian church at Llwynrhydowen, and soon afterward began to preach. In 1788 he joined the Baptist church at Aberduar and in 1789 was ordained pastor at Lleyn. In 1792 he went to Anglesey, where for many years he ruled over the Baptist churches; his salary was seventeen pounds a year. For a time he was a victim of the "Sandemanian heresy," but later he regained his orthodoxy. Finally the churches of Anglesey rebelled against his despotic government, and in 1826 he went to Caerphilly In 1828 he removed to Cardiff, and in 1832 to Carnarvon, his last pastorate. Evans was a man of ardent piety and a great and powerful preacher. His brethren called him the "Bunyan of Wales." His *Sermons* have been frequently published in Welsh (Eng. transl., with memoir, by Joseph Cross, Philadelphia, 1854).

Bibliography: Biographies have been written by: D. R. Stephens, London, 1847; D. M. Evans, ib. 1863; E. P. Hood, New York, 1901. Consult also *DNB*, xviii. 57–58.

EVANS, JOHN: 1. Non-conformist; b. at Wrexham (25 m. s. of Liverpool), Wales, c. 1680; d. in London May 16, 1730. He was ordained at Wrexham in 1702 and remained there as pastor of a new Congregational church till 1704, when he went to London as the assistant of Dr. Daniel Williams, whom he succeeded in 1716. In London he threw in his lot with the Presbyterians. He frequently presided at meetings of dissenters and was admired for his tolerant views. He published a number of sermons, completed Matthew Henry's commentary on Romans, and, intending to write a history of non-conformity, gathered much of the material subsequently used by Daniel Neal (q.v.) in his *History of the Puritans*. Evans is best known by a series of sermons entitled, *Practical Discourses concerning the Christian Temper* (4th ed., 2 vols., London, 1737; edited with a life, by J. Erskine, 1825).

Bibliography: J. Erskine, *Brief Account of John Evans, D.D.*, Edinburgh, 1802; M. Noble, *Biographical Hist. of England*, iii. 146, London, 1806; Walter Wilson, *Hist. and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches*, ii. 212–221, 4 vols., ib. 1808–14; Robert Williams, *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Welshmen*, Llandovery, 1852; *DNB*, xviii. 65–66.

2. Baptist; b. at Usk (11 m. s.w. of Monmouth) Oct. 2, 1767; d. at Islington, London, Jan. 25, 1827. After studying at King's College, Aberdeen, and at the University of Edinburgh (M.A., 1791; LL.D., Brown University, 1819), he went to London to take charge of the morning congregation of General Baptists in Worship Street. He was ordained pastor May 31, 1792, and served the church till his death. An illness in 1815 deprived him of the use of his legs, and after that time he had to be carried to his pulpit. In 1795 he opened a school at Hoxton Square (later at Islington) which he maintained for thirty years. Of his forty or more writings by far the most popular was his *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World* (London, 1795; 15th ed., revised, 1827). The book was translated into various languages, and during Evans' lifetime more than 100,000 copies were sold. For the copyright he received ten pounds. Other works are, *A Preservative against the Infidelity and Uncharitableness of the Eighteenth Century* (1796), a sequel to the above mentioned book; *An Attempt to Account for the Infidelity of the Late Mr. Gibbon* (1797); *An Essay on the Education of Youth* (1798); *Complete Religious Liberty Vindicated* (1813); and *The Christianity of the New Testament Imperishable and Impregnable* (1819).

Bibliography: Robert Williams, *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Welshmen*, Llandovery, 1852; S. A. Allibone, *Critical Dictionary of Eng. Literature*, i. 567, Philadelphia, 1891; *DNB*, xviii. 66–67.

EVANS, LLEWELYN IOAN: Presbyterian; b. at Treuddyn, North Wales, June 27, 1833; d. at

Bala (43 m. s.w. of Liverpool), Merioneth, Wales, July 25, 1892. He studied at the Welsh Presbyterian College, Bala (1846–49), and at Racine College, Racine, Wis. (B.S., 1854; B.A., 1856), and was graduated at Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O., in 1860. He was pastor of the Lane Seminary Church, 1860–63, and professor in Lane Seminary until 1892, of church history, 1860–63, of Biblical literature and exegesis 1863–71, of the Old Testament 1871–75, and of the New Testament after 1875. In 1892 he accepted a call to the Welsh Presbyterian College, but died four months afterward. He was a member of the Wisconsin legislature in 1856–57 and corresponding editor of *The Christian Central Herald* 1863–66. He translated and edited O. Zöckler's commentary on Job (New York, 1874); a posthumous volume of sermons *Preaching Christ* (1893) has a memoir by his colleague in Lane, H. P. Smith.

EVANSON, EDWARD: English clergyman; b. at Warrington (16 m. w.s.w. of Manchester), Lancashire, Apr. 21, 1731; d. at Colford (4 m. n.w. of Crediton), Devonshire, Sept. 25, 1805. He studied at Emmanuel College, Cambridge (B.A., 1749; M.A., 1753). After having officiated for several years as curate at Mitcham, Surrey, he was given the vicarage of South Mimms in 1768, and in 1769 also that of Tewkesbury. The following year he gave up South Mimms for the vicarage of Longdon, in Worcestershire. For questioning the divinity of Christ and altering the liturgy in conformity to Unitarian views a prosecution was instituted against him. First tried before the bishop of Gloucester, Jan. 16, 1775, the case was appealed to the Court of Arches, then to the Court of Delegates, and finally quashed on technical grounds in 1777. Evanson was very popular with his parishioners, and they subscribed freely to pay his expenses. In 1777 he gave up his charges and a few months later opened a school at Mitcham. After his marriage, in 1786, he purchased an estate at Blakenham, Suffolk, and later preached to a Unitarian church at Lympston. He was the author of *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists* (Ipswich, 1792), in which he rejects the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John, and other parts of the New Testament; *Arguments against and for the Sabbatical Observance of Sunday* (Ipswich, 1792), a result of a controversy with Priestley; and *Reflections on the State of Religion in Christendom* (London, 1802), which he considered his most important work; also *Sermons*, with a memoir (2 vols., London, 1807), containing the Easter sermon of Mar. 31, 1771, which led to his prosecution.

Bibliography: *Gentleman's Magazine*, ii (1805), 1233; Neast Harvard, *Narrative of the Origin and Progress of the Prosecution in Tewkesbury*, London, 1778; *DNB*, xviii. 78–79 (where further literature is indicated).

EVARESTUS (ARISTUS): According to the lists of the bishops of Rome, successor of Clement and predecessor of Alexander, about the beginning of the second century. Nothing is known about him, and his existence is doubtful.

Bibliography: Harnack, *Litteratur*, II., i. 144 sqq.

EVE: The name of the first woman, according to the Book of Genesis, where her creation is described (ii. 18–24), introduced by the soliloquy of Yahweh-Elohim: "It is not good for the man to be alone; I will create for him a help as his counterpart." Then God orders the animals to pass before Adam in pairs for review, that he may realize his utter loneliness and crave for the companionship of his own kind. While Adam is in a trance, God takes one of his ribs (so Eng. versions) and from it forms the woman. It is thought by some that the word rendered "rib" means any independent, separable part of the body,—a meaning favored by the usage of the word as "annex" in I Kings vi. 5; Ezek. xli. 5–7 Be this as it may, the point of the story is that the woman is not created independently of the man, but from that which has been taken from him. In I Cor. xi. 8–9 Paul lays emphasis upon this. Originally created as one, destined for personal relation with God, later man becomes husband to the woman who proceeds out of him. "This is at last," he cries, beholding her, "bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh." Recognizing her kinship to him, he names her in contradistinction to himself as "man" (Hebr. *ish*), the "female man" (Hebr. *isshah*). The historian adds, that for this reason (namely that woman has been created out of and for man) man will forsake father and mother and cling to his wife and thus become one flesh with her. Since *ish* can be a contraction of *issh* (=*insh*), the possibility of an etymological connection between *ish* and *isshah* is not to be denied offhand (cf. Strack on Gen. ii. 23).

It is further said: (1) that Eve was tempted into disobedience and induced her husband to commit the same sin (Gen. iii. 1–7; cf. II Cor. xi. 3; I Tim. ii. 14); (2) that she was punished by the pains of childbirth and her dependence on her husband (Gen. iii. 16); (3) that Adam relying upon God's promise of the victorious seed, gave her the name *Hawwah* ("Life") as the "mother of all living" (Gen. iii. 20); (4) that she welcomed the birth of her first-born in happy surprise at the divine gift of grace with the words, "I have brought forth a man with the help of Yahweh" (Gen. iv. 1).

(W Volck†.)

Bibliography: Smith, *Kinship*, p. 177; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 308, London, 1885; T. Nöldeke, in *ZDMG*, xlii (1888), 487; *JE*, v. 275–276.

EVERETT, CHARLES CARROLL: Unitarian; b. at Brunswick, Me., June 19, 1829; d. at Cambridge, Mass., Oct. 17, 1900. He was educated at Bowdoin College (B.A., 1850), and after completing his studies at the University of Berlin was successively tutor (1853–55) and professor (1855–57) of modern languages at Bowdoin, being also librarian during this entire period. He then entered the Harvard Divinity School, from which he was graduated in 1859, and in the same year became minister of the Independent Congregational (Unitarian) Church at Bangor, Me., where he remained ten years. From 1869 until his death he was Bussey professor of theology in Harvard Divinity School, and after 1878 was also dean. He wrote: *The Science of Thought* (Boston, 1869, new ed., 1890); *Religions before Christianity* (1883); *Fichte's Science of*

Knowledge (Chicago, 1884); *Poetry, Comedy, and Duty* (Boston, 1888); *Ethics for the People* (1891); *Gospel of Paul* (1893); *Ethics for Young People* (1894); and the posthumous *Essays Theological and Literary* (1901); *Immortality and other Essays* (1902); and *Psychological Elements of Religious Faith* (New York, 1902).

EVERLASTING GOSPEL. See JOACHIM OF FIORE.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. See APOLOGETICS.

EVIL-MERODACH. See BABYLONIA, VI. 7, § 3.

EVOLUTION.

I. Scope of the Term.
III. Darwin's Greek Predecessors.
Anaximander and Epicurus (§ 1).
Heraclitus and the Stoics (§ 2).
Empedocles and Democritus (§ 3).
Plato and Aristotle (§ 4).
III. Medieval Views.
Augustine, Erigena, and Cusa (§ 1).
Giordano Bruno (§ 2).
IV The Theory in Modern Philosophy.
Descartes, Leibnitz, Herder (§ 1).
Kant, Schelling, and Others (§ 2).
Schleiermacher and Hegel (§ 3).
Lamarck and Darwin (§ 4).
Haeckel, Fouillée, Guyau (§ 5).
Herbert Spencer (§ 6).
Modifications of Spencer (§ 7).

Evolution (or Evolutionism) is the view that the whole world and all it contains was not established once for all, but that it is in a state of perpetual motion and development.

I. Scope of the Term: As a metaphysical theory evolution is distinguished from the doctrine of Emanation (q.v.) by the fact that according to the latter the primal principle remains unchanged in quantity and quality in spite of every efflux and development proceeding from it; while according to the theory of development in its logical completeness nothing is excluded from the process of development or change—not even the original principle itself, if any such is assumed. Another point of difference is, that in the doctrine of emanation the development proceeds by various stages from the highest to ever lower stages, while evolution works continually toward what is higher and more perfect. Both these theories, and especially the latter, are opposed to that of creation, according to which the whole world and the matter contained in it are the products of a free and conscious act of God; and they are opposed equally to the sort of dualism, in the main Platonic, which conceives a permanent world of ideas in contrast with a mutable matter still to be formed and derives the visible phenomena from the influence of the former upon the latter. In a narrower biological sense evolution often means the development of organic beings from inorganic matter, and their further descent from one another. In the views of the evolutionistic school two different tendencies are to be distinguished. One is teleological, or more broadly organic, which deduces motion and change from internal causes or purposes inherent in the things subject to the process. This view is found not seldom in the older philosophers, and also in the modern, especially the German idealists. The other may be called the mechanical, since it ascribes the changes to external causes. This is the view chiefly held by modern evolutionists.

The terms evolution and development in this sense are of comparatively recent origin, and when they first make their appearance relate not to the entire universe but to some special partial process. The doctrine, however, which is now meant by them, appears in the early stages of Greek philosophy, and traces of it may be found in Oriental thought. The terms evolution and evolutionism, though found in a partially analogous sense as early as Nicholas of Cusa, and in Leibnitz and other seventeenth and eighteenth century philosophers in a sense still nearer to the modern, seem to have gained their full import first in England. They are now used also by French and German writers, and designate what forms an important, if not the central, point in the modern conception of the world.

II. Darwin's Greek Predecessors: Evolution is not so much a modern discovery as some of its advocates would have us believe. It made its appearance early in Greek philosophy, and maintained its position more or less, with the most diverse modifications, and frequently confused with the idea of emanation, until the close of ancient thought. The Greeks had, it is true, no term exactly equivalent to "evolution"; but when Thales asserts that all things originated from water; when Anaximenes calls air the principle of all things, regarding the subsequent process as a thinning or thickening, they must have considered individual beings and the phenomenal world as a result of evolution, even if they did not carry the process out in detail. Anaximander is often regarded as a precursor of the modern theory of development. He deduces living beings, in a gradual development, from moisture under the influence of warmth, and suggests the view that men originated from animals of another sort, since if they had come into existence as human beings, needing fostering care for a long time, they would not have been able to maintain their existence. In Empedocles, as in Epicurus and Lucretius, who follow in his footsteps, there are rudimentary suggestions of the Darwinian theory in its broader sense; and here too, as with Darwin, the mechanical principle comes in; the process is adapted to a certain end by a sort of natural selection, without regarding nature as deliberately forming its results for these ends.

1. Anaximander and Epicurus.

If the mechanical view is to be found in these philosophers, the teleological occurs in Heraclitus, who conceives the process as a rational development, in accordance with the Logos, and names steps of the process, as from igneous air to water, and thence to earth. The Stoics followed Heraclitus in the main lines of their physics. The primal principle is, as with him, igneous air, only that this is named God by them with much greater definiteness. The Godhead has life in itself, and develops into the universe, differentiating primarily into

2. Heraclitus and the Stoics.

two kinds of elements—the finer or active, and the coarser or passive. Formation or development goes on continuously, under the impulse of the formative principle, by whatever name it is known, until all is once more dissolved by the *ekpyrōsis* into the fundamental principle, and the whole process begins over again. Their conception of the process as analogous to the development of the seed finds special expression in their term of *logos spermatikos*. In one point the Stoics differ essentially from Heraclitus. With them the whole process is accomplished according to certain ends indwelling in the Godhead, which is a provident, careful intelligence, while no providence is assumed in Heraclitus.

3. Empedocles and Democritus.

Empedocles asserts definitely that the *sphairos*, as the full reconciliation of opposites, is opposed, as the superior, to the individual beings brought into existence by hatred, which are then once more united by love to the primal essence, the interchange of world-periods thus continuing indefinitely. Development is to be found also in the atomistic philosopher Democritus; in a purely mechanical manner without any purpose, bodies come into existence out of atoms, and ultimately entire worlds appear and disappear from and to eternity. Like his predecessors, Democritus, deduces organic beings from what is inorganic—moist earth or slime.

4. Plato and Aristotle.

Development, as well as the process of becoming in general, was denied by the Eleatic philosophers. Their doctrine, diametrically opposed to the older thoroughgoing evolutionism, had its influence in determining the acceptance of unchangeable ideas, or forms, by Plato and Aristotle. Though Plato reproduces the doctrine of Heraclitus as to the flux of all things in the phenomenal world, he denies any continuous change in the world of ideas. Change is permanent only in so far as the eternal forms stamp themselves upon individual objects. Though this, as a rule, takes place but imperfectly, the stubborn mass is so far affected that all works out as far as possible for the best. The demiurge willed that all should become as far as possible like himself; and so the world finally becomes beautiful and perfect. Here we have a development, though the principle which has the most real existence does not change; the forms, or archetypal ideas, remain eternally what they are.

In Aristotle also the forms are the real existences, working in matter but eternally remaining the same, at once the motive cause and the effectual end of all things. Here the idea of evolution is clearer than in Plato, especially for the physical world, which is wholly dominated by purpose. The transition from lifeless to living matter is a gradual one, so that the dividing-line between them is scarcely perceptible. Next to lifeless matter comes the vegetable kingdom, which seems, compared with the inorganic, to have life, but appears lifeless compared with the organic. The transition from plants to animals is again a gradual one. The lowest organisms originate from the primeval slime, or from animal differentiation; there is a continual progression from simple, undeveloped types to the higher and more perfect. As the highest stage, the end and aim of the whole process, man appears; all lower forms are merely unsuccessful attempts to produce him. The ape is a transitional stage between man and other viviparous animals. If development has so important a work in Aristotle's physics, it is not less important in his metaphysics. The whole transition from potentiality to actuality (from *dynamis* to *entelecheia*) is nothing but a transition from the lower to the higher, everything striving to assimilate itself to the absolutely perfect, to the Divine. Thus Aristotle, like Plato, regards the entire order of the universe as a sort of deification. But the part played in the development by the Godhead, the absolutely immaterial form, is less than that of the forms which operate in matter, since, being already everything, it is incapable of becoming anything else. Thus Aristotle, despite his evolutionistic notions, does not take the view of a thoroughgoing evolutionist as regards the universe; nor do the Neoplatonists, whose highest principle remains wholly unchanged, though all things emanate from it.

III. Medieval Views: No more absolutely than with Plato and Aristotle was the idea of evolution accepted by patristic and scholastic theology and philosophy, both on account of the dualism which runs through them as an echo of the two great Greek masters, and on account of the generally accepted Christian theory of creation. However, evolution is not generally denied; and with Augustine (*De civitate dei*, xv. 1) it is taken as the basis for a philosophy of history. Erigena and some of his followers seem to teach a sort of evolution. The issue of finite beings from God is called *analysis* or *resolutio*, in contrast to the *reversio*, or *deificatio*, the return to God, who once more assimilates all things. God himself, although denominated—the beginning, middle, and end, all in all—remains unmixed in his own essence, transcendent though immanent in the world. The teaching of Nicholas of Cusa is similar to Erigena's, though a certain amount of Pythagoreanism comes in here. The world exhibits explicitly what the Godhead implicitly contains; the world is an animated, ordered whole, in which God is everywhere present. Since God embraces all things in himself, he unites all opposites: he is the *complicatio omnium contradictoriorum*. The idea of evolution thus appears in Nicholas in a rather pantheistic form, but it is not logically carried out.

1. Augustine, Erigena, and Cusa.

In spite of some obscurities in his conception of the world Giordano Bruno is a little clearer. According to him God is the immanent first cause in the universe; there is no difference between matter and form; matter, which includes in itself forms and ends, is the source of all becoming and of all actuality. The infinite ether which fills infinite space conceals within itself the nucleus of all things, and they proceed from it according to determinate laws, yet in a teleological manner. Thus the worlds originate not by an arbitrary act, but by an inner necessity of the divine nature. They are

2. Giordano Bruno.

natura naturata, as distinguished from the operative nature of God, *natura naturans*, which is present in all things as the being of all that is, the beauty of all that is fair. As in the Stoic teaching, with which Bruno's philosophy has much in common, the conception of evolution comes out clearly both for physics and metaphysics.

IV. The Theory in Modern Philosophy: Leibnitz attempted to reconcile the mechanical-physical and the teleological views, after Descartes, in his *Principia philosophiæ*, excluding all purpose, had explained nature, both lifeless and living, as mere mechanism. It is right, however, to point out that Descartes had a metaphysics above his physics, in which the conception of God took an important place, and that thus the mechanical notion of evolution did not really include everything. In Leibnitz the principles of mechanics and physics are dependent upon the direction of a supreme intelligence, without which they would be inexplicable to us. Only by such a preliminary assumption are we able to recognize that one ordered thing follows upon another continuously. It is in this sense that the law of continuity is to be understood, which is of such great importance in Leibnitz. At bottom it is the same as the law of ordered development. The genera of all beings follow continuously one upon another, and between the main classes, as between animals and vegetables, there must be a continuous sequence of intermediate beings. Here again, however, evolution is not taught in its most thorough form, since the divine monad, of God, does not come into the world but transcends it.

1. Descartes, Leibnitz, Herder.

Among the German philosophers of the eighteenth century Herder must be mentioned first of the pioneers of modern evolutionism. He lays down the doctrine of a continuous development in the unity of nature from inorganic to organic, from the stone to the plant, from the plant to the animal, and from the animal to man. As nature develops according to fixed laws and natural conditions, so does history, which is only a continuation of the process of nature. Both nature and history labor to educate man in perfect humanity; but as this is seldom attained, a future life is suggested. Lessing had dwelt on the education of the human race as a development to the higher and more perfect. It is only recently that the significance of Herder, in regard to the conception and treatment of historic development, has been adequately recognized. Goethe also followed out the idea of evolution in his zoological and botanical investigations, with his theory of the metamorphosis of plants and his endeavor to discover unity in different organisms.

Kant is also often mentioned as having been an early teacher of the modern theory of descent. It is true he considers the analogy of the forms which he finds in various classes of organisms a ground for supposing that they may have come originally from a common source. He calls the hypothesis that specifically different beings have originated one from the other "a daring adventure of the reason." But he entertains the thought that in a later epoch "an orang-outang or a chimpanzee may develop the organs which serve for walking, grasping objects, and speaking—in short, that he may evolve the structure of man, with an organ for the use of reason, which shall gradually develop itself by social culture." Here, indeed, important ideas of Darwin were anticipated; but Kant's critical system was such that development could have no predominant place in it.

2. Kant, Schelling, and Others.

The idea of evolution came out more strongly in his German idealistic successors, especially in Schelling, who regarded nature as a preliminary stage to mind, and the process of physical development as continuing in history. The unconscious productions of nature are only unsuccessful attempts to reflect itself; lifeless nature is an immature intelligence, so that in its phenomena an intelligent character appears only unconsciously. Its highest aim, that of becoming an object to itself, is only attained in the highest and last reflection—in man, or in what we call reason, through which for the first time nature returns perfectly upon itself. All stages of nature are connected by a common life, and show in their development a conclusive unity. The course of history as a whole must be conceived as offering a gradually progressive revelation of the Absolute. For this he names three periods—that of fate, that of nature, and that of providence, of which we are now in the second. Schelling's followers carried the idea of development somewhat further than their master. This is true especially of Oken, who conceives natural science as the science of the eternal transformation of God into the world, of the dissolution of the Absolute into plurality, and of its continuous further operation in this plurality. The development is continued through the vegetable and animal kingdoms up to man, who in his art and science and polity completely establishes the will of nature. Oken, it is true, conceived man as the sole object of all animal development, so that the lower stages are only abortive attempts to produce him—a theory afterward controverted by Ernst von Baer and Cuvier, the former of whom, standing somewhat in opposition to Darwin, is of great interest to the student of the history of the theory of evolution.

Some evolutionistic ideas are found in Krause and Schleiermacher; but Hegel, with his absolute idealism, is a more notable representative of them. In his system philosophy is the science of the Absolute, of the absolute reason developing or unfolding itself. Reason develops itself first in the abstract element of thought, then expresses itself externally in nature, and finally returns from this externalization into itself in mind. As Heraclitus had taught eternal becoming, so Hegel, who avowedly accepted all the propositions of the Ephesian philosopher in his logic, taught eternal proceeding. The difference between the Greek and the German was that the former believed in the flux of matter, of fire transmuting itself by degrees into all things, and in nature as the sole existence, outside of which there was nothing; while the latter conceived the

3. Schleiermacher and Hegel.

abstract idea or reason as that which really is or becomes, and nature as only a necessary but transient phase in the process of development. With Heraclitus evolution meant the return of all things into the primal principle followed by a new world-development; with Hegel it was an eternal process of thought, giving no answer to the question as to the end of historical development.

4. Lamarck and Darwin.

While Heraclitus had laid down his doctrine of eternal becoming rather by intuition than on the ground of experience, and the entire evolutionary process of Hegel had been expressly conceived as based on pure thought, Darwin's epoch-making doctrine rested upon a vast mass of ascertained facts. He was, of course, not the first to lay down the origin of species one from another as a formal doctrine. Besides those predecessors of his to whom allusion has already been made, two others may be mentioned here: his father, Erasmus Darwin, who emphasized organic variability; and still more Lamarck, who denied the immutability of species and forms, and claimed to have demonstrated by observation the gradual development of the animal kingdom. What is new in Charles Darwin is not his theory of descent, but its confirmation by the theory of natural selection and the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. Thus a result is brought about which corresponds as far as possible to a rational end in a purely mechanical process, without any cooperation of teleological principles, without any innate tendency in the organisms to proceed to a higher stage. This theory postulates in the later organisms deviations from the earlier ones, and that these deviations, in so far as they are improvements, perpetuate themselves and become generic marks of differentiation. This, however, imports a difficulty, since the origin of the first of these deviations is inexplicable. The differentia of mankind, whom Darwin, led by the force of analogy, deduces from a species of apes, consists in intellect and moral qualities, but comes into existence only by degrees. The moral sensibilities develop from the original social impulse innate in man; this impulse is an effort to secure not so much individual happiness as the general welfare.

5. Haeckel, Fouillée, Guyau.

It would be impossible to name here all those who, in different countries, have followed in Darwin's footsteps, first in the biological field and then in those of psychology, ethics, sociology, and religion. They have carried his teaching further in several directions, modifying it to some extent and making it fruitful, while positivism has not seldom come into alliance with it. In Germany Ernst Haeckel must be mentioned with his biogenetic law, according to which the development of the individual is an epitome of the history of the race, and with his less securely grounded notion of the world-ether as a creative deity. In France Alfred Fouillée worked out a theory of idea-forces, a combination of Platonic idealism with English (though not specifically Darwinian) evolutionism. Marie-Jean Guyau understood by evolution a life led according to the fundamental law that the most intensive life is also the most extensive. He develops his ethics altogether from the facts of the social existence of mankind, and his religion is a universal sociomorphism, the feeling of the unity of man with the entire cosmos.

6. Herbert Spencer.

The most careful and thorough development of the whole system took place in England. For a long time it was represented principally by the work of Herbert Spencer, who had come out for the principle of evolution even before the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. He carries the idea through the whole range of philosophy in his great *System of Synthetic Philosophy* and undertakes to show that development is the highest law of all nature, not merely of the organic. As the foundation of all that exists, though itself unknowable and only revealing itself in material and mental forms, he places a power, the Absolute, of which we have but an indefinite conception. The individual processes of the world of phenomena are classed under the head of evolution, or extension of movement, with which integration of matter, union into a single whole, is connected, and dissolution or absorption of movement, which includes disintegration of matter, the breaking of connection. Both processes go on simultaneously, and include the history of every existence which we can perceive. In the course of their development the organisms incorporate matter with themselves; the plant grows by taking into itself elements which have previously existed in the form of gases, and the animal by assimilating elements found in plants and in other animals. The same sort of integration is observed in social organisms, as when nomadic families unite into a tribe, or subjects under a prince, and princes under a king. In like manner integration is evident in the development of language, of art, and of science, especially philosophy. But as the individuals unite into a whole, a strongly marked differentiation goes on at the same time, as in the distinction between the surface and the interior of the earth, or between various climates. Natural selection is not considered necessary to account for varying species, but gradual conditions of life create them. The aim of the development is to show a condition of perfect balance in the whole; when this is attained, the development, in virtue of the continuous operation of external powers, passes into dissolution. Those epochs of development and of dissolution follow alternately upon each other. This view of Spencer suggests the *hodos anō* and *hodos katō* of Heraclitus, and his flowing back of individual things into the primal principle.

Similar principles are carried out not only for organic phenomena but also for mental and social; and on the basis of the theory of evolution a remarkable combination of intuitionism and empiricism is achieved. In his principles of sociology Spencer lays down the laws of hyperorganic evolution, and gives the various stages of human customs and especially of religious ideas, deducing all religion much too one-sidedly from ancestor-worship. The belief in an immortal "second self" is explained by such phenomena as shadows and echoes.

The notion of gods is supposed to arise from the idea of a ghostly life after death. In his *Principles of Ethics* he attempts a similar compromise between intuitionism and empiricism, deducing the consciousness of duty from innumerable accumulated experiences. The compelling element in moral actions, originally arising from fear of religious, civil, or social punishment, disappears with the development of true morality. There is no permanent opposition between egoism and altruism, but the latter develops simultaneously with the former.

7. Modifications of Spencer.

Spencer's ethical principles were fruitfully modified, especially by Sir Leslie Stephen and S. Alexander, though with constant adherence to the idea of development. While the doctrine of evolution in Huxley and Tyndall is associated with agnosticism, and thus freed from all connection with metaphysics, as indeed was the case with Spencer, in spite of his recognition of the Absolute as the necessary basis for religion and for thought, in another direction an attempt was made to combine evolutionism closely with a metaphysics in which the idea of God was prominent. Thus the evolution theory of Clifford and Romanes led them to a thoroughgoing monism, and that of J. M. F. Schiller to pluralism. According to the last-named a personal deity, limited in power, exists side by side with a multitude of intellectual beings, who existed before the formation of the world in a chaotic state as absolutely isolated individuals. The process of world formation begins with the decision of the divine Spirit to bring a harmony of the cosmos out of these many existences. Though Spencer's influence in philosophical development was not so great in Germany as in England, the idea of development has continued in recent years to exert no little power. Space forbids more than a mention of Lotze's teleological idealism; Von Hartmann's absolute monism, in which the goal of the teleological development of the universe is the reversion of the will into not-willing; Wundt's metaphysics of the will, according to which the world is a development, an eternal becoming, in which nature is a preliminary stage to mind; and Nietzsche's individualism, the final point of which is the development of the superman. (M. HEINZE.)

V. Relation to Modern Theology: When the Darwinian hypothesis was first broached in Great Britain and America it caused nothing less than a panic in nearly all circles of religious thought. The fear was that if it was true it must result in the transformation of all religious values. Here and there it was indeed advocated by distinguished scientists and theologians in the interests of faith, but it was for the most part met by fierce and prolonged opposition. The following beliefs became the center of interest and have remained such until the present day. (1) The Biblical account of the creation: whether it had a beginning; whether God was the Creator, or the world was eternally in process of becoming; further, whether the Genesis story could be harmonized with geology, astronomy, biology, archeology, and other sciences. (2) The Biblical account of man; whether he was wholly and immediately created by God, or, even if his body was organically related to the animal world, his mind was a direct creation, or finally, whether both body and mind shared in the development from lower forms of life. (3) Concerning man's personal history: whether he began in a state of " original righteousness " from which he fell only to be recovered by a miraculous intervention, or started low down, at the outset scarcely to be distinguished from the highest existing animal consciousness. (4) Involved in man's personal history was a profound modification of the origin and development of the idea of God from the lowest fetishism or animism through polytheism to ethical monotheism (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1), of the idea of the Scriptures as not inerrant and infallible, but as recording the stages through which man's consciousness has passed in its apprehension of the ethical and religious meaning of life, and of the entire range of Christian beliefs—providence, sin and evil, the person and work of Christ, the Christian life, the Church, and the future. A similar change of values has occurred in other regions of thought. (5) In psychology and ethics (q.v.) the static has given place to the genetic and historic point of view. (6) In apologetics (q.v.) for the traditional conception of prophecy as predictive and miracles as out of relation to natural law has been substituted the spiritual and dynamic doctrine of man and the world. (7) The philosophy of religion has found in comparative religion the key to its interpretation of religion as a fact of universal human experience. (8) While the uniqueness of Christianity is recognized—now more than ever before—its organic relation to pre-Christian types of experience is the subject of exhaustive inquiry and its development as a system of beliefs, institutions, and ideals becomes more clearly evident to students of its history.

Since evolution as a scientific theory is only a method according to which at any given period existing conditions have come into being, it does not primarily concern the grounds of reality. It is atheistic only when as a philosophy it reduces the world-ground to a system of mechanical necessity (see ATHEISM). When, however, the ultimate reality is conceived as a power realizing rational ends in the universe, evolution is affirmed as the uniform method by which this power fulfils its purposes (cf. B. P. Bowne, *Theism*, New York, 1902).

C. A. B.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: From the philosophic standpoint for ancient and modern periods best for consultation are the works on the history of philosophy by E. Zeller (*Die Philosophie der Griechen*), Tübingen, 1844, latest ed., 1892, Eng. transl., 1897; W. Windelband, Freiburg, 1890–92, Eng. transl., New York, 1893; F. Ueberweg, 10th ed. by Heinze, Berlin, 1903–07, Eng. transl. of 4th ed., London, 1875–76; J. E. Erdmann, 2 vols., Berlin, 1895–96, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., 3 vols. London, 1892–98. For the modern period: F. Bowen, *Modern Philosophy*, New York, 1877; K. Fischer, *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie*, vol. i., Heidelberg, 1897, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., New York, 1887.

For philosophy of the representatives of thought mentioned in the text consult: G. Teichmüller, *Studien zur Geschichte der Begriffe*, pp. 1–70, 545–588, Berlin, 1844 (on Anaximander); W. Wallace, *Epicureanism*, London, 1880; F. Lassalle, *Die Philosophie Herakleitos*, Berlin, 1892; P. Tannery, *La Cosmogonie d'Empédocle*, in *Revue philosophique*, xxiv (1887), 285–300; A. Brieger,

Die Urbewegung der Atome und die Weltentstehung bei Leukippus und Demokrit, Halle, 1884; W. Pater, *Plato and Platonism*, London, 1893; C. Baeumker, *Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie*, pp. 210–232, Münster, 1890 (on Aristotle); A. Gardner, *Studies in John the Scot* (Erigena), London, 1900; F. J. Clemens, *Giordano Bruno und Nicolaus Cusanus*, Bonn, 1847; J. Uebinger, *Philosophie des Nicolaus Cusanus*, Würzburg, 1881; L. Kuhlenbeck, *Giordano Bruno, . seine Weltanschauung*, Leipsic, 1890; J. P. Mahaffy, *Descartes*, Edinburgh, 1880; A. Foucher de Careil, *Leibniz, Descartes et Spinoza*, Paris, 1863; F. J. Schmidt, *Herder's pantheistische Weltanschauung*, Berlin, 1888; I. Kant, *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte*, ed. A. von Oettingen, Leipsic, 1898; E. von Hartmann, *Schelling's positive Philosophie als Einheit von Hegel und Schopenhauer*, Berlin, 1869. A review of the subject is H. F. Osborn, *From the Greeks to Darwin*, vol. i., London, 1894.

For the modern doctrine the pivotal work is C. R. Darwin, *Origin of Species*, London, 1859, and often, cf. his *Descent of Man* and *Selection in Relation to Sex*, latest ed., 2 vols., New York, 1905. For the United States the theory was set forth by J. Fiske, *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, 4 vols., new ed., Boston, 1903, cf. his *Darwinism and Other Essays*, ib 1884. Consult further: St. G. Mivart, *On the Genesis of Species*, London, 1871; A. R. Wallace, *Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection*, London, 1871; idem, *Darwinism*, ib. 1889; idem, *Studies Scientific and Social*, ib. 1900; G. J. Romanes, *Darwin and After Darwin*, Chicago, 1882; J. Le Conte, *Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought*, New York, 1888; A. Weismann, *Studies in the Theory of Descent*, London, 1882; idem, *Heredity and Kindred Biological Problems*, ib. 1889; J. Croll, *Philosophical Basis of Evolution*, ib. 1890; J. McCosh, *Religious Aspect of Evolution*, New York, 1890; H. Macqueary, *Evolution of Man and Christianity*, ib. 1891; E. Caird, *Essays in Literature and Philosophy*, Glasgow, 1892; A. J. Dodson, *Evolution and Religion*, London, 1893; H. Calderwood, *Evolution and Man's Place in Nature*, ib. 1896; T. H. Huxley, *Evolution and Ethics*, ib. 1894; D. S. Jordan, *Factors in Organic Evolution*, Boston, 1894; E. P. Evans, *Evolutional Ethics*, London, 1898; F. W. Headley, *Problems of Evolution*, ib. 1901; E. Haeckel, *Evolution of Man*, ib. 1905; M. M. Metcalf, *Theory of Organic Evolution*, ib. 1905; J. Scouller, *Law of Evolution, Its True Philosophical Basis*, ib. 1905; A. Weismann, *Evolution Theory*, 2 vols.,ib. 1905; N. C. Anderson, *Evolution of the Human Soul and the Future Life Scientifically Demonstrated*, St. Paul, 1907; R. H. Francé, *Der heutige Stand der darwin'schen Fragen*, Leipsic, 1907; G. Paulin, *No Struggle for Existence, No Natural Selection*, Edinburgh, 1908; E. B. Poulton, *Essays on Evolution*, New York, 1908.

On V. consult: (1) J. W. Dawson, *Origin of the World*, New York, 1877; A. Winchell, *Doctrine of Evolution*, ib. 1874; B. F. Tefft, *Evolution and Christianity*, Boston, 1885; C. B. Warring, *Genesis i. and Its Critics*, New York, 1887; E. Clodd, *Story of Creation*, London, 1888. (2) J. W. Dawson, ut sup.; H. Drummond, *Ascent of Man*, New York, 1894; J. M. Tyler, *Whence and Whither of Man*, ib. 1896; H. W. Conn, *Method of Evolution*, ib. 1900.. (3) C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii., Philadelphia, 1865; J. M. Baldwin, *Development and Evolution*, New York, 1902. (4) E. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, Glasgow, 1893; A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield, *Inspiration*, in *Presbyterian Review*, 1881, pp. 225 sqq.; G. T. Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, New York, 1883; A. B. Bruce, *Providential Order of the World*, ib. 1897; G. Jones, *Ascent through Christ*, ib. 1900; M. Dods, *The Bible, Its Origin and Nature*, ib. 1905; J. Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, ib. 1906. (5) H. R. Marshall, *Instinct and Reason*, ib. 1898; J. M. Baldwin, ut sup.; J. T. Gulick, *Evolution, Racial and Habitudinal*, Washington, 1905; E. A. Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. i., London, 1906. (6) A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, Edinburgh, 1892; G. B. Foster, *Finality of the Christian Religion*, Chicago, 1906. (7) A. Menzies, *Hist. of Religion*, London, 1895; E. Caird, ut sup.; G. T. Ladd, *Phil. of Religion*, New York, 1905. (8) C. H. Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, Boston, 1890; E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, London, 1890; A. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* ib. 1901; W. A. Brown, *Essence of Christianity*, New York, 1902.

EWALD, GEORG HEINRICH AUGUST: Orientalist and Biblical scholar; b. at Göttingen Nov. 16, 1803; d. there May 4, 1875. His father was a cloth-weaver. Having been thoroughly prepared in the gymnasium of his native town, he studied classical philology, Orientalia, and theology at its university. After spending two years as teacher in the gymnasium at Wolfenbüttel, he returned to Göttingen in 1824 as repetent in the theological faculty. In 1827 he became extraordinary professor; ordinary professor in 1831; in 1833, member of the Society of Sciences; in 1835, titular professor of Oriental languages and member of the honorary faculty. In 1836 he was made doctor of theology by the faculty of Copenhagen. Notwithstanding his extensive professorial activity he found time for ample production. Besides works on the Hebrew and Arabic languages, the most important of which is the *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des alten Bundes* (5th ed., Leipsic, 1844; Eng. transl., from the 2d ed., London, 1836; of part iii.—syntax—from the 8th ed., Edinburgh, 1879), there may be mentioned in this period, *Commentarius in apokalypsin Johannis* (1828) and *Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes* (4 parts, Göttingen, 1835–1839). He contributed also to several periodicals. These works are the product of strictly scientific researches, careful and at the same time generously proportioned. Ewald's importance was conceded willingly, and his renown was large. But this fortunate season had a sudden check; in 1837 he was dismissed from his public position because, with some of his colleagues, he had addressed a memorial to the board of university regents in Hanover, expostulating against the arbitrary repeal, by act of King Ernst August, of the liberal constitution of 1833.

After sojourning four months in England, Ewald accepted a call to Tübingen, where he worked until 1848 as professor, first in the philosophical, subsequently in the theological faculty. His productive activity during this period was confined mainly to the Biblical sciences. Among other works he issued *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1840–41; Eng. transl., 5 vols., London, 1875–81); *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (7 vols., Göttingen, 1843–59; Eng. transl., of vols. i.–iv., 5 vols., London, 1867–74), a work of permanent value on account of its careful use of the sources. His dismissal from Göttingen having been hailed as an event of political consequence, Ewald unfortunately felt himself prompted to publish impassioned polemical writings, which embittered him personally, and drove him to a morbidly exaggerated estimation of himself. His irritability also injured him with his Tübingen colleagues, among whom he especially antagonized F. C. Baur, with both spoken and written vehemence.

In 1848 Ewald, at his own request, was reinstated at Göttingen. From this time forth he labored particularly upon the New Testament writings, in express opposition to Baur and Strauss. He occupied himself especially with pseudepigraphy, proceeding from foundations laid by his earlier investigations. His comprehensive scholarship is faithfully reflected in his *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissen-*

schaft (12 vols., Göttingen, 1849–65). Unhappily his sensitiveness and testiness continually increased. He interfered in every event of state and church life, and published his views thereon in prefaces and postscripts to his books. He had taken part in founding the *Protestant Union* (q.v.) in 1863; nevertheless he subsequently withdrew from the same, on failing to carry through a manifesto that he had planned against the Prussian government. His sharp expressions of opinion in political affairs had already brought him into repeated conflict with the government. When in 1867 he refused the oath of allegiance to the king of Prussia, his removal from the philosophical faculty was effected by a ministerial rescript. Through subsequent utterances he also forfeited, in 1868, the right of delivering lectures. From 1869 he represented, in the Imperial Diet, the capital city of Hanover. Not even the victories of German arms in 1870–71, and the restoration of the Empire, prevailed to efface his bitterness in the political domain. Yet with all this he continued a diligent laborious scholar, and still published extensive works; in particular, *Die Bücher des Neuen Bundes übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen, 1871–72), and *Die Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes* (4 vols., Leipsic, 1871–1876). The latter work contains—with rather tedious exposition, it is true—his aggregate view of Biblical religion. CARL BERTHEAU.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Göttinger gelehrte Nachrichten*, 1875, pp. 340–344; A. Dillmann, in *Im neuen Reich*, V., i (1875), 778–786; *ADB*, vi. 438–442; T. W Davies, *Heinrich Ewald, Orientalist and Theologian*, London, 1903.

EWALD (HERMANN AUGUST), PAUL: German Protestant; b. at Leipsic Jan. 13, 1857 He studied in Erlangen and Leipsic (Ph. D., 1881), and from 1880 to 1882 was a member of the clergy staff of St. Paul's, Leipsic. In 1883 he became privat-docent at the university in the same city, and associate professor in 1887. In 1886 he went to Vienna as professor of the New Testament in the Protestant faculty of that city, and in 1894 to Erlangen as professor of dogmatic theology and New Testament exegesis. He has edited G. B. Winer's *Komparative Darstellung der Lehrbegriffe der verschiedenen christlichen Kirchenparteien* (Leipsic, 1882), and has written *Der Einfluss der stoisch-ciceronianischen Moral auf die Darstellung der Ethik bei Ambrosius* (Leipsic, 1881); *De vocis syneideseos apud scriptores Novi Testamenti vi ac potestate* (1883); *Die Hauptprobleme der Evangelienfrage* (1890); *Der geschichtliche Christus und die synoptischen Evangelien* (1892); *Ueber das Verhältnis der systematischen Theologie zur Schriftwissenschaft* (1895); *Ueber die Glaubenswürdigkeit der Evangelien* (1897); *Religion und Christentum* (1898); *Wer war Jesus?* (1899); *Der Christ und die Wissenschaft* (1903); and *Kommentar zu den Briefen des Paulus an die Ephesier, Kolossier, und Philemon* (1905).

EWING, FINIS: One of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; b. in Bedford County, Va., June 10, 1773; d. at Lexington, Mo., July 4, 1841. He early removed to Davidson County, Tenn., and subsequently to Logan County, Ky. His education was limited, but under the influence of revivalist preachers he offered himself as a candidate for the Presbyterian ministry. About 1800 he was licensed as a probationer and in Nov., 1803, was ordained by the Cumberland presbytery. The Kentucky synod did not recognize this ordination and in 1806 dissolved the Cumberland presbytery. As a result, Ewing, with two others, organized on Feb. 4, 1810, the first presbytery of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (see PRESBYTERIANS). In 1820 he removed to Missouri, settling first in what is now Cooper County. He soon built up a large congregation at New Lebanon, which still flourishes. In 1836 he went to Lexington, Lafayette County, Mo., where he labored till his death. He published *Lectures on Important Subjects in Divinity* (Nashville, 1824).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. R. Cossitt, *Life and Times of Rev. Finis Ewing*, Nashville, 1853; R. Beard, *Biographical Sketches of . Early Ministers of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, 2 vols., ib. 1867; J. B. Lindsley, *Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian Hist.* in *Theological Medium*, 1877–78; R. V. Foster, in *American Church History Series*, xi. 259, 268, 288.

EXACTIONS (*Exactiones talliæ*): In canon law, taxes of an extraordinary sort, either entirely new, or old taxes levied at a higher rate. They are essentially illegal, and were forbidden as early as the Third Council of Toledo (509). When levied, valid ground (*manifesta ac rationabilis causa*) must exist, and they must be limited to the indispensable requirement (*moderatum auxilium*).

EXARCH: A title applied to the head of an ecclesiastical province, whose rank, historically, was equivalent sometimes to that of Patriarch (q.v.), sometimes to that of Metropolitan or Archbishop (qq.v.). Cf. Bingham, *Origines*, II., xvi. 5, xvii. 1–2, where the synodical decisions are given.

EXCLUSION, RIGHT OF (*Exclusiva*): In the wider sense, the right of a sovereign or secular official to veto the nomination of a candidate for an ecclesiastical office. In the narrower and more usual sense, the *jus exclusivæ* is the right to exclude a candidate for the papacy who is unacceptable to the power exercising it. The constitutional influence of the emperors on papal elections ceased in the eleventh century; but since the fifteenth the great Roman Catholic powers (the Roman-German Empire, Austria, France, Spain) have, as a matter of fact, attempted to exercise a certain influence in the direction of what appeared to be their interests by means of cardinals devoted to them, and to exclude undesirable candidates by getting together so many votes for their own that the others failed of the necessary two-thirds. As this practise became publicly recognized, since the seventeenth century it has developed into a formal assumption of the right to exclude from election one candidate for each power, by a declaration made before the termination of the balloting through a cardinal authorized for the purpose. Besides the powers named, Naples and Portugal claimed this right. Though it was not exercised at the election of Leo XIII., at that of Pius X. in 1903 the emperor of Austria attempted to enforce it against Cardinal Rampolla. It was understood, however,

that the Sacred College paid no heed to it, and that there was little prospect of its being allowed at any future election.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject has been especially studied by L. Wahrmund, in *Das Ausschliessungsrecht bei den Papstwahlen*, Vienna, 1888; *Exclusionsrecht bei den Papstwahlen*, ib. 1890; *Die Bulle "Æterni patris filius,"* ib. 1894. Consult further: N. Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, pp. 356, 416, London, 1858; J. B. Sagmüller, *Die Papstwahlbullen und das staatliche Recht der Exklusiva*, Tübingen, 1892; idem, *Neueste Lösungsversuche in der Frage der Exklusiva*, Freiburg, 1896; L. Lector, *Le Conclave. Origine, histoire, organisation*, Paris, 1894.

EXCLUSIVE BRETHREN. See PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

EXCOMMUNICATION.

Early Practise (§ 1).
The Lesser and Greater Excommunication (§ 2).
Various Legal Provisions (§ 3).
Changes Introduced by the Reformation (§ 4).

Excommunication is the exclusion of an offender from full church fellowship, which may occur as a means of discipline in varying degrees. On the basis of various passages of Scripture (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23; I Thess. v. 14; James v. 16; I John i. 8 sqq.; v. 16; II Cor. v. 18 sqq.; for the old Testament ban, see LAW, HEBREW, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL), the Church of the earliest times undertook to punish grievous sinners by such exclusion, and either refused entirely to restore them to its fellowship or restored them only after they had attested their sorrow by penance (q.v.). After the Councils of Ancyra (314) and Nicæa (325),

1. Early Practise.

four stages of penance developed through which the offender had to pass. During the first year he lay prostrate and weeping in the vestibule of the church and begged those entering in to pray for him (Gk. *proskłausis;* Lat. *fletus*). Next, commonly for three years, he had a place in the back of the church, with the unbaptized catechumens, where he was allowed to hear the reading of the Scriptures (*akroasis; auditio*). Then he was allowed to enter the body of the church, and to pray prostrate, while the bishop and the faithful interceded for him (*hypoptōsis; genuflexio, substratio*). After further penitential exercises, he was allowed to pray standing, with the rest of the congregation, and to be present at the most sacred portion of the liturgy, the *missa fidelium*, from which the catechumens were excluded (*systasis; consistentia*). Only after the completion of this long process was he restored to full communion. Originally this discipline was applied also to sins which had given no public scandal, until Pope Leo I. forbade them to be publicly confessed (450), after which public penance was only applied to open sins—the graver ones in the manner described, the lesser ones without exclusion from the fellowship of the faithful, but still so as to atone for public scandal, and covering the exclusion from the *missa fidelium*. Both of these methods are called *pœnæ medicinales* by Augustine; their application belonged to the bishop, whose action must be recognized by his brother bishops, and could be reversed only by himself.

In the Frankish kingdom, after the institution of the Synodal Courts (q.v.), penitential discipline was placed in their charge, when once the *testes synodales* had established the existence of an open scandal. By degrees the old distinct stages of penance, which had at first been accepted also in the West, fell into disuse in the Frankish kingdom. Finally public penance practically ceased, and the exclusion from the sacraments became regularly

2. The Lesser and Greater Excommunication.

(as it had been exceptionally) an independent measure of discipline, becoming known as the lesser excommunication, while the old exclusion from all blessings and graces of the Church was called the greater. In the view of the canon law these form the general means used by the ecclesiastical body for the maintenance of its discipline. Both presuppose a cause which is both public and grave. None can be excommunicated but living, baptized persons who have the use of reason. The bishop has the right of excommunication over those who belong to his diocese, though his sentence is valid also outside of it; a prelate with quasiepiscopal jurisdiction, such as a papal legate, has it in the territory for which he is commissioned; and the pope for the Church at large. The power of reconciliation is vested in the same person, and it requires as a condition the promise of obedience for the future. Excommunication is either *juris* or *hominis*, i.e., prescribed by law or pronounced at the decision of an authorized person in a case not explicitly covered by the law. It is divided again into *excommunicatio latæ sententiæ*, where it takes

3. Various Legal Provisions.

effect *ipso facto* upon the commission of a specified offense, or *ferendæ sententiæ*, where it follows an express judicial decision. The latter class requires two warnings at least. Ignorance of the law excuses from the former, and to be effective it must be definitely proclaimed. The lesser excommunication deprives a person of the sacraments; the greater cuts him off from all rights—the mass may not be celebrated in his presence, he can not hold a benefice, exercise jurisdiction, or take part in an ecclesiastical election, and Christian burial is denied him; intercourse with the faithful is prohibited except in certain specified cases. Since the time of Gregory IX. the term Anathema (q.v.) has been applied to the solemn declaration of the greater excommunication (cf. the form in the *Pontificale Romanum*).

The canon law expects that the State will give effect on its side to the social consequences of exclusion from Christian fellowship. The extent to which the civil governments of the Middle Ages were subservient to the power of the Church over society may be seen in the way they responded to such appeals; thus the Emperor Frederick II. in 1213 and 1219 and Henry VII. in 1230 expressed their willingness to inflict the ban of the Empire

4. Changes Introduced by the Reformation.

upon any excommunicated offender who was still recalcitrant at the end of six weeks after his sentence. These conditions prevailed down to the Reformation; but in the countries where it prevailed a great change took place. The greater excommunication, as being a secular punishment, was not recognized by the

Reformed Church; the lesser was retained as a measure of instructive discipline, generally in the hands of the pastor, although Luther and others held that Scripturally it ought to be administered by the whole Christian community; but it was felt that if the pastor admitted an unworthy person to the Lord's Supper, he became partaker of the sin, and so the power of exclusion was left in his hands. The method of procedure prescribed by the German Reformers was public only for public sins, and always based on Matt. xviii. 55 sqq. Since the abolition of private confession did away with the warning of priest to penitent, it was made before church-members summoned for the purpose, preferably the elders, and followed by a prohibition to approach the communion-table and sometimes a withdrawal of other rites as well, including betrothal; but this was not necessarily public, unless the offender was obstinate, when he might be cut off from the Church in the presence of the whole congregation. The consistories always took part in the proceedings at one stage or another; and after the middle of the sixteenth century, as they had inherited many of the other episcopal powers, came to monopolize this, leaving the pastor only the duty of publishing the sentence. The greater excommunication practically died out in the seventeenth century, and the lesser fell very much into disuse with the growth of rationalism. It is, however, obvious that no religious community can hope to enforce its regulations which does not possess and if necessary use the power of excluding members who persistently refuse obedience to them. The modern Roman Catholic Church maintains the position taken in the canon law, in this as in other regards, though considerable modifications have taken place in practise, especially as a result of the constitution *Apostolicæ sedis* of Pius IX. (1869), which removed a number of the cases of excommunication *latæ sententiæ*, while enforcing discipline vigorously in some other respects. See Church Discipline. (E. Friedberg.)

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, books xvi.–xvii.; E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, 3 vols., Antwerp, 1736–37; N. Marshall, *Penitential Discipline*, London, 1714, Oxford, 1844; F. Kober, *Der Kirchenbann*, Tübingen, 1857; J. Fessler, *Der Kirchenbann und seine Folgen*, Vienna, 1860; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, §§ 243–297, Berlin, 1869; H. C. Lea, *Studies in Church Hist.*, Philadelphia, 1883; *DCA*, i. 638–642 (able); S. Mandl, *Der Bann*, Brünn, 1898; *EB*, i. 468–469.

EXEGESIS OR HERMENEUTICS.

I. The Conception and Problem of Biblical Exegesis.
Exegesis a Necessary Science (§ 1).
Relations to Criticism and Philology (§ 2).
Exegesis and Dogmatics (§ 3).
Exegesis and Theological Science (§ 4).
II. The Method.
Three Kinds of Exegesis (§ 1).
Philological Exegesis (§ 2).
Historical Exegesis (§ 3).
Employment of Analogy and Hypothesis (§ 4).
Stylistic Exegesis (§ 5).
III. Historical Review of Exegetical Principles and Methods.
Transition from Dogmatic to Historical Principles (§ 1).
Origen (§ 2).
The Antiochian School (§ 3).
Later Patristic Methods (§ 4).
The Middle Ages (§ 5).
The Reformation (§ 6).
Post-Reformation Theories (§ 7).
Exegesis as Affected by History (§ 8).
IV. The Forms of Interpretation of Scripture.
Glosses and Scholia (§ 1).
Commentaries and Their Type (§ 2).
Translation and Paraphrase (§ 3).
V. History of Exegesis.
Prepatristic Exegesis (§ 1).
Patristic and Medieval Exegesis (§ 2).
Exegesis Since the Reformation (§ 3).
German Exegesis in the Nineteenth Century (§ 4).
Modern French Exegesis (§ 5).
Exegesis in Holland (§ 6).
English Exegesis (§ 7).
Exegesis in the United States (§ 8).

Biblical exegesis or hermeneutics is the first of the four departments of theological science (interpretative, historical, dogmatic, practical); its function is the interpretation of Scripture.

I. The Conception and Problem of Biblical Exegesis: That the oral and written tradition coming from the past may continue to be a vital and spiritual possession necessitates both understanding and appropriation of the sense. Understanding is achieved either directly by simple apprehension, or mediately by a process. In the latter case, the object is approached methodically that it may be learned in its limits, essence, and causes. To understand whatever heritage the past produced under conditions which no longer exist, correct insight is needed into the disparity of past and present. And when such a heritage has acquired a certain authority either as a model (classical literature) or as a norm of right living (the *Corpus juris*) or as the source of Christian inspiration (the Bible), the necessity for assurance that a correct understanding is reached is the motive for constructing a theory of exposition. Out of this grew the technical term "hermeneutics," first used by Plato as expressing the art of rightly apprehending and setting forth the etymology and value of any given word. The term is derived from *hermēneuein*, "to interpret," "to make intelligible that which is obscure," hence often simply "to translate from a foreign tongue" (John i. 38, 41–42), and then it passed to the meaning "to explicate." In the last sense it was used by the Fathers, and their commentaries were named *Hermēneiai*. The term was used when a man explained either that which originated with another (as a deity) or the cogitations of his own spirit. Similarly "exegesis" is from *exēgeisthai*, "to lead forth, interpret." So that as the theory of explanation exegesis or hermeneutics has to make intelligible whatever has survived because of its essential value. Its concern is not merely with rhetoric, as Schleiermacher would have it, making of it merely an art. It is both a science and an art; a science in that it formulates definite rules of procedure, an art in that it infuses new life into material by making it a new and present possession.

1. Exegesis a Necessary Science.

To bring a thing to the understanding is to make it serviceable in sense and significance. Appreciation of the significance leads to a decision as to worth, and is therefore akin to criticism; to estab-

lish the sense is to explicate with the proper means as the case is conceived in the mind. Exegesis is to be differentiated from criticism, nearly related though they are. The former is inductive and analytical; the latter is synthetic. Exegesis asks what a thing means; criticism asks about its correctness and truth. Exegesis seeks to know, to interpret, to explicate; criticism to value and correct. But the conditions of serviceable and artistic comprehension lie partly in the general laws of human thought and expression, partly in the special quality of the material under examination. "He who would the poet know, must to the poet's country go" is a universal maxim. Sympathy gives the closest insight. So that for appreciation of a religious thought more than esthetic apprehension is required. In this criticism and exegesis are handmaidens, both are peerless schoolmistresses to lead to Christ, but only under the condition stated. Exegetical art is called out by material which, originating in the past, has by its inherent worth come down to the present instinct with vital force. In early times, it dealt with Homer and the myths because they had meaning for religious and spiritual life. The type was philological, and had in view complete explanation from the standpoint of history, archeology, philosophy, and esthetics. Indeed, exegesis gains its individuality and completeness through the material with which it deals so far as this is a coherent whole and has relationship to the life of the present. Thus modern exegesis has attained definite form in two branches, jurisprudence and theology, working upon the *Corpus juris* and the Bible. In these two spheres the character of the material produces essentially different results. Jurisprudential exegesis expounds the rules and methods which Roman law embraced, hence the interest is largely historical.

2. Relations to Criticism and Philology.

Biblical exegesis deals with a work which was the canon of the Church, the understanding and the use of which has from the beginning been vexed by religious postulates and dogmatic claims. When, then, historical explanation of its facts brought ever more clearly into view departure from dogmatic conclusions or even opposition to them, questions were raised about the Bible, its character and its authority, and about the right of exegesis and its methods, which must remain for each generation to solve, since the Bible is ever the religious source for the Christian Church. And then questions arise as to the functions of exegesis. Is it purely explicative or is it normative? Exegetical and ecclesiastical interests clash. When the latter prevail, producing the Roman Catholic type, exegesis is bound up with the tradition of the Church, and almost becomes supererogatory in the dogma that Scripture is its own interpreter. On the other hand, emphasis upon the historical element alone without reference to the religious character of the material makes of exegesis a mere discipline. Choice may be made between a purely historical and grammatical type and one which is to have somewhat of a dogmatic character. If the canon is a historical development, the question appears to be decided. The function of exegesis is to know and discern the character of Scripture and why it has that character. Their own limitations require that exegesis and dogmatics work independently. Methodical and reliable exegesis guarantees that dogmatics is building not upon mysteries and fraud; while the necessity for a dogmatic formulation of the contents of Scripture produces in exegesis the consciousness of the seriousness of its task. Exegesis produces from the sources a Biblical history and theology which have no immediate relation to the task of dogmatics. It works over the Scriptures independently and positively not merely to satisfy itself with certainty, but as a support to churchly theology by furnishing it its certainty. On this account there is required complete severance from all dogmatic postulates as furthering both scientific and ecclesiastical interests.

3. Exegesis and Dogmatics.

But if the purely historical character of exegesis is maintained, does it not become an exclusive discipline? The Old Testament contains the remains of a national religious literature which presents peculiarities of speech, special forms of religious ideas, and having a purpose which is entirely different from that of the New Testament, which has by no means the character of a national literature and bespeaks a movement differing in type from that which produced the Old Testament (see HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, II). These two parts of the Bible offer different problems to exegesis, both being religious sources, and through the origin of Christianity historically bound together. Must there be two kinds of exegesis? Here neither the postulates of a method alien to the essence of the testimonies to faith in Scripture itself nor ecclesiastical decisions regarding the nature of the canon determine the method, which is ruled alone by the contents of Scripture in its reciprocal relations. From a dogmatic truth exegetical verity does not follow, but one does proceed from exegetical truth to dogmatic verity. This makes clear one of the relations of exegesis to theological science. It has grown out of ecclesiastical needs and is security for the pure Christian character of the Christian organization, and so has vindicated its right to a place in theological science. It has in view not simply the history of Israel and the origin of Christianity, but definite testimony to the religious spirit which has bound together the Old and the New Testament. It employs the underlying disciplines of Biblical philology, introduction, archeology, history of the times, and criticism of the text. Trustworthy results are attained only when questions of the trustworthiness of the text are raised and settled, and so with other problems. As a result, the exegete, like the historian, has in his hand the power of palingenesis by educing and strengthening the sense of the historically and psychologically possible.

4. Exegesis and Theological Science.

II. The Method: The ultimate purpose of the exegete is reached when on the one side he under-

stands the object of the exposition to be the same as that of the original writing, and on the other side has the same point of view of the origin, purpose, and means of attaining the purpose as the author had. He stands for his hearers as did the author for his. This is the ideal, which in the nature of the case can be only partially realized, since the gulf between the circumstances under which the text arose and those in which it exists for the exegete can not be entirely closed. Then too the matter of the individuality of the author complicates the problem, since psychological analogies are not sufficient ground for certainty in reconstruction. The realities of the original speech, the historical conditions, and the inner life of the text have to be brought home to the understanding. Of these the first two help to realize the sense, the third helps to the meaning; the first two tell what was actually said and done, the third gives the purpose of saying or doing. Exegesis falls then into three parts: philological, revealing the structure and vocabulary of the language; historical, setting forth the text as the result of certain actual conditions of origin, contents, and purpose; and stylistic, building on the other two and leading to the valuation of the text. Other names employed to designate these stages or varieties are grammatical, psychological, and rhetorical exegesis.

1. Three Kinds of Exegesis.

Philological exegesis has a double problem, lexical and grammatical. It takes into account not only grammatical structure and etymology, but also transformations wrought in forms and meanings of words by the ordinary historical development of language and by new needs and relations. This involves the mastery of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek as the original tongues, and may require also that of the languages of the versions. The Greek of the Septuagint comes into consideration as a *lingua franca* of old times and as the language of the Bible of early Christianity. So the varieties of Greek in the New Testament, from the almost classic forms of the Lucan literature to the Hebraistic character of the Johannean writings demand notice (see Hellenistic Greek). The definition of the character of Biblical language in general and of New Testament Greek in particular under the influence of the dogmatic view-point has become the object of dissidence since the rearing of an independent philological science which reproduces rather the views of the early Fathers than the dogmatic learning of post-Reformation times. Origen notes the providential readiness of the Greek to receive the content of revelation in New Testament times, while Augustine speaks of the spiritual impress the language received, particularly under Paul. In general, a new eloquence was discerned in this tongue fitting it to act as the mediator of a new divine wisdom. This was a point which humanism missed, and strife was waged between the Hebraists and the purists until Winer protested against the boundless arbitrariness with which the New Testament Greek was handled. One of the questions remaining open is how far insight into the words of Jesus can be promoted by translation into the Syro-Chaldaic spoken dialect of his times. There is needed in this department of study not only knowledge of language but the linguistic sense, something difficult to attain in the case of a dead tongue. To attain it necessitates not only knowledge of word meanings and of homonyms and synonyms and etymology, but insight into the national life. With this, extraordinary forms and *hapax legomena* and new forms give insight into historical conditions. And as a last aid in this matter comes philological conjecture on the basis of parallels and analogies.

2. Philological Exegesis.

Historical exegesis arises from the fact that complete understanding of a document necessitates knowledge of the conditions under which it was written, taking into account the circumstances of both author and reader. The document must be put into its historical environment. But this involves not merely the problem of history but that of the psychology of the writer, as furnishing the index of his purpose and method. Fundamental in Biblical exegesis is the consideration of the epoch-making character of the writings. The more necessary then becomes knowledge of their origin, content, purpose, and influence in their total relations with the whole life of the age when they arose. All-important here is the view of the world and of all its relationships set forth in the documents. And necessary too are estimates of the originality of the conceptions contained and their relationship to or departure from those current at the time. For the Old Testament the current conditions of the Semitic world were important; for the New, the Old Testament religion, Judaism and Hellenism. Historical exegesis takes all such considerations into account, and attempts to understand the author through his work and his work through the author.

3. Historical Exegesis.

An important means to a historical understanding is the correct employment of analogy. The relation of representations in the Bible to extra-Biblical representations, their independent or derivative character, are matters of importance. Two coats of like cut may bespeak the same tailor, but do not imply similar disposition or accomplishments in the wearers. Paul's characterization of ethnic cults as demon-worship does not imply that he shared all the Jewish hatred and misconception which this judgment carried with it in the Jewish mind. So analogy does not imply wholesale transference of identity. An assistant in this same direction is the use of hypothesis, especially in the case of a broken connection. It assumes a connection in the circumstances or in the train of thought which does not appear on the surface. A broken torso guides to a reconstruction only when there are certain traces of the original form. But in history the help of psychology is often available to fill in outlines only partly discernible. The " historical " explanation of the inner development of Jesus and the psychological deductions concerning the conversion of Paul are cases in

4. Employment of Analogy and Hypothesis.

point. But conceptions that are foreign or dogmatic merely are misleading in the use of hypothesis. The mistake must not be made of confusing historical learning with historical insight or the historic sense. A century ago all religion was regarded as the production of priestcraft, and Jesus was regarded simply as a wise teacher. In the present, under the influence of the doctrine of evolution, religion is regarded as the product of a process of unfolding, and the ethical and intellectual elements of the religious life suffer the consequences. The antidotes for the eisegesis and dislocations which in the interest of dogmatics have invaded this province are reality and piety, especially piety. The interpreter of Scripture handles books which are religious sources for the communities of believers. It is not his task to infer hypothetically the religion of Israel and the Gospel and to discover the real behind that which is alleged, but to bring to the understanding the actual fact as it exists. Like the historian, he seeks the objective sense, not the subjective.

Stylistic or rhetorical exegesis, according to Luther (Preface to Ecclesiastes), seeks to know the scope of a book, its object and aim. This complements the work of philological and historical exegesis, and places the document in its literary category. When historical exegesis has shown the purpose, rhetorical exegesis reveals the connection of the means devoted to that purpose.

5. Stylistic Exegesis. This operation arranges its work in rhetorical and in logical departments. The former concerns the quality and propriety of the expression, the turns and variety of usage, the art or naïveté of the narration, the art-forms of literary expression, and the like. The latter looks at the thought construction, estimates it as closely woven or flowing or disconnected, as orderly or of mere aggregated parts. It sets forth the inner life and the totality of character of the whole document. It serves to give the psychological side of historical exposition, reveals the relation of the author to the writing, and in this way discovers the individuality of the author.

The writings unified in the Bible have either little or no connection with the Greek productions with which they are often compared. This is especially true of the Old Testament, and almost equally of the New Testament, particularly of the Gospels and Epistles. These sprang out of the new needs of missionary enterprise and the founding of Christian communities. Consequently they have their own modes of expression and means of explanation, to interpret which requires entry into their world of thought. Religious pragmatism, prophetic oracle, the disclosure of apocalyptic, the liturgical lyric and gnomic wisdom continue to exist in the New Testament, but the center in this case is the work of Jesus. The difference between the sayings and parables of Jesus and the dialectic of Plato is very great. It is therefore of importance exactly to catch the imagery and the peculiar usage of these writings. Whoever sees merely picture and metaphor where the picture is the very impress, the integrating essence, of truth makes a beast of burden of a Pegasus. If one takes the symbolism of a religious outlook (like Luke xvi. 19-20) or a promise (like Mark xiv. 25) as literal, he falsifies the idea by a process of mythologizing. To treat the paradoxes of Jesus literally as statement of a law, as one might the command about baptizing, leads into absurdity. Emphasis upon the word "is" in the institution of the Lord's Supper makes one a captive to dogmatic authority. "One may translate literally, but that is not the way to exposition or understanding." Stylistic exegesis leads from the whole to the parts, and so brings the exegetical process to its fit conclusion.

III. Historical Review of Exegetical Principles and Methods: The development of exegetical theory was parallel with the history of doctrine, or, rather, there was a reciprocity of interaction, since exegesis apprehends the sources in sense and meaning as a help to the building of dogma. So the history of the science of exegesis is not to be confused with the history of exegesis, the one having to do with the theory, the other with the practise. The early Church assumed the inspiration of

1. Transition from Dogmatic to Historical Principles. Scripture and sought a serviceable theological and ecclesiastical exposition. The growth of the historical sense and the rise of an independent philosophy raised the question of the authority of Scripture, and the dogma of inspiration and of infallibility could not halt the movement thus begun. In this respect the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* of Spinoza (1670 in Eng. transl., new ed., London, 1877) was epoch-making. The seventeenth century saw the gradual rise of a science of antiquities, which brought new material and new points of view. Then came the consideration that the authors of the books of the Bible were to be regarded as human authors. Next questions of method arose, and the schools of classical philology, Pietism, and rationalism expressed their aims. Men debated how far profane writers could be used in the process of elucidation, and unsifted material was collected by Grotius, Wetstein, and many others. The result of all this work was summed up in Wolle's *Regulæ triginta hermeneuticæ ad circumspectam scripturæ illustrationem ex autoribus profanis utiles* (Leipsic, 1722). The end of the eighteenth century, by which time greater independence had been gained, brought a deepening of the work, which was largely accomplished through the effort after a historical theology.

Origen was the first to construct a theory of explanation of Scripture. With all patristic exegetes he assumed that Scripture contained divine wisdom and the teachings of salvation, and that the spirit of God was the author. The sense is therefore in all circumstances deep, clear, true, and productive of salvation. But it is evident that many passages are obscure if the sense of the words is taken in such passages as those which refer to the days of creation, to the Garden of Eden, the anthropomorphisms, and the "high mountain"

2. Origen. in the story of the temptation. In case the obvious sense given is not worthy, there must be an undersense which is concealed and must be brought out. Indeed,

corresponding to the trichotomy of man, the sense is threefold. The sense of the words is the flesh of Scripture (for simple men), the soul is the moral sense (I Cor. ix. 9), while still beyond is a pneumatic sense (I Cor. ii. 6–7). This is what became known as the "theory" in exegesis or the "allegorical method." In this method Origen was the follower of Philo (whom he would enroll among the Church Fathers). Philo's starting-point was the same and his idea of a hidden sense the same. But his idea was in turn borrowed from the Greeks, since Plato had already conceived the same method in treating Homer, and the Stoics had developed the system. Whether Philo was influenced by the rules of exegesis of the Palestinian schools is an open question; Origen could hardly have been decided by this influence. Two principles rule the exegesis of Origen. His view of Scripture is correct; and where he follows this alone, his exegesis is keen yet delicate. But he further insists that Scripture must say what the exegete decides is worthy of deity. When the literal sense seems unworthy, he seeks a "mystic, tropical, analogical, or concealed" sense by means of "theory."

In opposition to Origen the Antiochian school of exegesis sought to be fair to historical results both through "theory" and explanation. Eustathius of Antioch (c. 325, *De Engastrimytho*, ed. T. Zahn, *TU*, 1886) opposed Origen. Diodorus of Tarsus made theory and allegory synonymous. Isidore of Pelusium and Photius distinguished between theoretical and historical exegesis, the former leading to the moral or mystical sense, the latter to the precise sense. Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. about 428) regarded theoretical exegesis as accurate investigation and knowledge over against arbitrary discovery of a secret sense, in which he followed Diodorus, and in numerous commentaries and in polemical writings assailed the conclusions of the allegorists as those of mythologists. Job was to him a dramatic poem, the Song an erotic celebrating Solomon's marriage, while he explained prophecies by contemporary actions and persons.

3. The Antiochian School.

Its dogmatic and practical usefulness secured to the "theory" of Origen its influence, and its subjective character favored correction in the interest of ecclesiasticism. This last was continually advancing both in the Eastern and the Western Church. The tendency induced eisegesis, but was now in the direction of illustrations and proofs of dogma. So Augustine declares that whatever in the divine word can not be referred to a noble end or to the truth of faith is to be taken as figurative, and the norm for this is the rule of faith (*De doctrina Christiana*, II., xx. 10). Against Augustine, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa (in his *Hexaemeron*) would have nothing to do with allegory, but explained the text in accordance with its evident meaning. And yet he at times rejoiced in allegorical exposition, especially in the Song. Jerome in his many works binds together literal exposition with a "spiritual knowledge," and speaks of the progress from the littleness of the letter to the grace of the spiritual intelligence. Far superior to him in deep insight and clearness is Augustine, who works out his ideal of an exegete (in *De doctrina Christiana*) and shows that he informs the results of scientific exegesis with a fine rhetorical sense (on Augustine cf. R. Simon, *Hist. critique des commentateurs du Nouveau Testament*, p. 250, Paris, 1693). The writers on exegesis continued to formulate rules by which to derive a multiple sense from Scripture. Such a one was Eucherius of Lyons (d. about 452), whose *Formulæ spiritualis intelligentiæ* divides "contemplative theology" into historical discussion and the "interpretation of spiritual knowledge," which last is arbitrary allegorizing, turning all figurative language to dogmatic, religious, or ethical purposes. Yet in the "historical discussion" he produces valuable comments upon Scripture passages. Thus there is produced a compromise between the school of Antioch and Origen. Junilius (d. about 552) speaks for the exegetical tradition of the school of Nisibis (in his *Instituta regularia divinæ legis*, ed. H. Kihn, Freiburg, 1880). He would have Scripture so explained that the explanation shall accord with the writer's individuality and with the environment of time, place, order, and intention. Thus patristic exegesis involved on one side historical explanation, on the other dogmatic, allegorizing attempts to determine an inner sense.

4. Later Patristic Methods.

The exegesis of the Middle Ages rested upon the principles already in existence, except that the tendency was toward an increase of eisegesis in the interest of building up an ecclesiastical tradition of interpretation. Its cause is well stated by Vincent of Lerins (d. about 450), when he says: "Every one interprets Scripture differently; Novatian has one interpretation, Sabellius another, Donatus another, still others are by Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, etc." Faith founded itself upon the authority of the divine law and upon the tradition of the Church catholic. Thomas Aquinas speaks not only for the exegesis of the Middle Ages but for Catholicism when he says: "The author of Sacred Scripture is God, in whose power it is to fit not only words to meanings (which man can do), but even things themselves." And then he proceeds to develop a fourfold exegesis, literal, figurative, moral, and anagogical, in which the figurative and anagogical are arbitrarily distinguished. Thus Jerusalem signifies the city, the Church, a settled and moral order, and the everlasting life.

5. The Middle Ages.

The Reformation drew a stroke through all these refinements and returned to the sources, discovering anew the word of God beneath the mounds of ecclesiastical tradition. It pronounced the dictum: The Church is not to determine what Scripture teaches, but Scripture determines what ought to be taught in the Church. Humanism led the way with Erasmus as its spokesman. Luther declared it his task to translate the Scripture in its simple sense. But the orientation of exegesis was still religious, Scripture proving itself to be a book of testimonies for the reality of the

6. The Reformation.

revelation of God. Melanchthon drew the portrait of an Evangelical theologian: "A good theologian and faithful interpreter of the heavenly teaching should be expert first in language, next in logic, and then a witness." Criticism was free and Luther spoke without reserve regarding the value of the canonical books. Reliable interpretation was demanded, which contributed clearness and certainty to faith. In the stress of the first need the interpreters dealt little with theory and contented themselves with propounding fundamentals. Scripture was defined as the collection of standard sources of the Christian religion. Alongside the formula: "Scripture is the interpreter of Scripture" was another: "Let all knowledge and exposition be according to the analogy of faith."

7. Post-Reformation Theories.

For the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, Scripture is the document containing the teaching inspired by the Holy Spirit. The Bible could therefore not be self-inconsistent, and exegesis was prevailingly apologetic. The *textus receptus* was canonized, and in the Old Testament the inspiration of the pointing was maintained. Rules for interpretation were formulated anew, and the *Philologia sacra* of S. Glass (ed. I. A. Dathe, Leipsic, 1776) was the exegetical text-book of the Lutheran confession. From this point of view an important book is that of A. Rivet, *Isagoge ad scripturam sacri Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (Leyden, 1627). For the Roman Catholic Church the norm continued to be expressed by the maxim: "Tradition (or the Church) is the interpreter of sacred Scripture," and more attention was paid to patristic work upon Scripture than to philological investigation. Richard Simon laid the foundations of a historical-critical science of Scripture, but not without a polemical purpose against the Protestant principles regarding the Bible. Simon's work was put on the Index because of its critical openness; its meaning was first grasped by Protestants when historical criticism came to its rights. The next step in the way was taken by the opponents of Protestant confessionalism. Socinian exegesis remained without influence because of its subjective dogmatism. But such work as that done by Grotius was important, and the danger to confessionalism was discerned by A. Calovius and attacked in his *Biblia Veteris Testamenti illustrata* (4 vols., Frankfort, 1672–76). Meyer advanced the cause of unprejudiced reason in a remarkable critique upon the fundamental dogma "Scripture its own interpreter," reason being, according to him, a gift of God displayed both in Scripture and in the formulation of dogma. A. H. Francke bewailed the fact that men concerned themselves with criticism, which affected only the outer shell of Scripture, and left untouched the elucidation of the deeper sense of Scripture. He therefore turned aside from the dogmatic valuation of the Bible and applied himself to a devotional exposition founded on scientific principles and applying the psychological principle of the individuality of the author. Against the Pietistic school of exegesis the Reformed theologian J. A. Turretin busied himself in the interest of a grammatical-historical exegesis (*Tractatus bipartitus*, Geneva, 1728, ed. Teller, 1776). His principle is that theology is the teaching transmitted in Scripture, and to the study of Scripture the mind should come as a *tabula rasa*, ready to receive the true sense. Here also first appeared the postulate of a presumptionless exegesis as opposed to a dogmatic. The eighteenth century saw the first scientific work written in German on exegesis, that by S. J. Baumgarten, *Ausführlicher Vortrag der biblischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Bertram, Halle, 1767). The theology of this writer is Pietistic, founded upon the philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolff. He was preceded by J. A. Bengel (also of the Pietistic school), whose principal labors were upon text criticism. In the Dutch school J. Cocceius was the antipodes of Grotius, so that the saying took form: "Grotius could find Christ nowhere in sacred literature, Cocceius found him everywhere."

8. Exegesis as Affected by History.

With Herder, Kant, and the founders of the new school of history (Niebuhr) and of research into the sources of classical philology (F A. Wolf) began new times with new results, based upon historical investigation into the religion of the Old Testament and examination of the sources of early Christianity. The Protestant doctrine of inspiration became untenable under the leadership of J. S. Semler, J. J. Wetstein, and J. A. Ernesti, all under the sway of the historical spirit but still not entirely freed from dogmatic influence. Thus Semler held Scripture to contain the word of God and therefore not to contain inconsistencies. Difficulties were dismissed on the theory of Accommodation (q.v.). L. J. Rückert (*Commentar über den Brief an die Römer*, Leipsic, 1831) remarked that "the exegete, as an exegete, is neither orthodox nor heterodox, neither a supernaturalist nor a rationalist nor a pantheist, neither pious nor godless, neither emotional nor without feeling." D. F. Strauss could not deride sufficiently the doctrine of inspiration held by the early Protestants. Exegetical theory was therefore influenced greatly by the effort to solve the historical-critical problems while allowing the revelational character of Scripture. The effort was making to recognize the human and the divine side of the Bible. To this problem philosophy made no contributions of importance. Kant's contribution was not philosophical but practical. H. Olshausen's attempt to reinstate the allegorical method met no success, while the work of his predecessors was summed up in Immer's *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments* (Wittenberg, 1873; Eng. transl., *Hermeneutics of the New Testament*, Andover, 1877). F Lücke attempted to give to exegesis a stronger theological tendency, and F H. Germar sought a religious guaranty for the results of the hermeneutical processes under a method which should include the historical-philological method and should take account of the harmony of Scripture. J. T. Beck endeavored to advance the cause by a "pneumatic interpretation" on the basis that the Bible is an organism, the spirit of each part of which is the author, which spirit the interpreter must incarnate in his own holy life before he can explain Scripture.

J. L. S. Lutz would have the philological-historical interpretation united with the religious, ecclesiastical and dogmatic, in which he was not far removed from the standpoint of the Reformation. Hofmann came to nearly the same conclusion by another road. He took the Bible to be the history of salvation, a history independent of ordinary development and of a different kind. It is the result of the working of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ, The theologian, in order to interpret Scripture in truth, must come as a member of the Church and as a witness of the salvation of which he is possessed. Hofmann's service was then contributed in favor of ecclesiastical exegesis, recognizing, however, the historical character of the Bible. The general result of work upon the theory of interpretation is that for a positive exegesis, free from both positive and negative dogmatic interpolations, the guaranty is in a conjoint operation of all varieties, which gives and receives, controls and criticizes, all in order to grasp and to expound the life which is inculcated in the Holy Scriptures.

IV. The Forms of Interpretation of Scripture: The results of the exegetical process may be made available in many different forms; the exegete may indicate how the text is to be understood, in which case he becomes a glossator, scholiast, or commentator; or he may identify himself, so to speak, with the text, may take the place of the author and produce a translation or a paraphrase. All these forms have been highly developed in the centuries during which exegesis has been at work.

1. Glosses and Scholia. The simplest form of elucidation is the gloss, which explains an obscure or uncommon expression by a clear or usual one or substitutes for a foreign term the corresponding translation. This method has been applied to Homer, Plato, the *Corpus juris*, etc., as well as to the Bible, and the value of its results is varied. The glossator is first of all an interpreter, not an expounder, hence the collections of glosses among the Byzantines were the basis of the lexicons, of which those of Hesychius, Suidas, and Phavorinus contain many Biblical glosses. In the Western Church gloss came to have a special meaning, and the excerpts from the collections became the brief but authoritative commentaries of scholasticism, written either after the text, beside it, or in interlinear fashion. Two of the most noted are that of Walafrid Strabo and that of Anselm of Laon (see GLOSSES, BIBLICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL). The gloss extended itself beyond the explanation of a word and became a scholium. This was originally a marginal note, and scholia often were for use in the schools. No methodical investigation of Biblical scholia has yet been made.

2. Commentaries and Their Type. Commentaries differ from glosses and scholia in that they attempt to explain the whole of a writing and not isolated expressions, and they have literary unity. The purpose is to give a full and pure impression of the writing so that the reader of the commentary may be in as good a position to receive the sense as was the original reader. Its relation to the original is that of a bust of Socrates or Augustus to their subjects, though for Biblical writings that ideal is unattainable. A commentary of the Bible must keep in view not merely the Bible, but also the history of its interpretation if it is to present adequately the present status. It can accomplish its end only by division of labor, parting the work into the linguistic, historical, and rhetorical or stylistic. The danger throughout is that attention to minute points will obscure a comprehensive view, while regard for the total impression may cause oversight and error in minutiæ. The double purpose, to make clear the document as a whole and to clear up individual difficulties, has produced two types of results, the glossatorial and the reproductive, of which Bengel's *Gnomon* and Ewald's or Hofmann's commentaries are respectively examples. For a rounded understanding of Scripture both methods are necessary. It would be desirable to give a history of commentaries, since the one-sidedness of certain periods tends to be reproduced in other periods, but space forbids anything but the most brief attempt. For the patristic type Origen's commentaries gave the pattern, concerned as they were with particulars, and turning aside for allegorical meanings and applications. The Antiochian school was concise and scholiastic (see ANTIOCH, SCHOOL OF). During the period of formulation of dogma, exegesis tended toward catenæ, excerpts of scholia and glosses (see CATENÆ), and to schematization of traditional renderings. Humanism awakened the grammatical sense, but produced few commentaries. The Reformation emphasized the religious content. The age of the confessions tended again to heap matter together, and philological comment reproduced scholiastic form. Pietism roamed freely in ascetic edification. The nineteenth century endeavored to employ the linguistic-historical method and at the same time to preserve the religious interests, to bind together analysis, reproduction, and glossematic clearing up of minutiæ, all this with regard to the history of the science.

3. Translation and Paraphrase. Translation of a document is the fruit and test of complete understanding, and gives an equivalent for the original, so far as that is possible. It is limited by the fact that much in the original can not be carried over into another speech. Artistic translation must therefore move freely in order to reproduce the original. The translation is a new dress which enables the stranger to gage the worth of the original. Thus Luther did not merely translate the Gospel, he made it German. Translation is limited also by its aim to reproduce the sense of the original in appropriate verbiage. Here literalness is often no gain, as when a Greek translator reproduced the Hebrew sign of the accusative, though as such it had no equivalent or meaning in the Greek. The desire to combine the merits of a translation and of a commentary resulted in the paraphrase, which reproduces the sense together with what is implied though not expressly said. Patristic exegesis did much of this work, and Erasmus, a supreme artist in this respect, went to school to Origen, Chrysostom, and Jerome.

The best paraphrast clings to the sense while he develops pregnant meanings and elucidates the obscure.

V. History of Exegesis: The Old Testament was at first the subject of the exegetical art. In the synagogue two methods developed, the halacha or exposition of law, and the haggadah, which sought the deeper sense and applied it to practise. In this direction was developed cabalistic interpretation, which saw the secrets of revelation enclosed in numerical values (see CABALA).

1. Prepatristic Exegesis.

The Christian Church appropriated the Old Testament, and indeed largely in the Septuagint version which often serves excellently as an interpretation. The methods of Jewish exegetical work on the Old Testament influenced the writers of the New Testament. The Apocalypse is cabalistic, Paul and Hebrews reproduce the Alexandrine methods. Generally, however, the use of the Old Testament in the New is original, while it is employed from a new religious standpoint. It starts from faith in Christ as the God-sent savior who came providentially in the fulness of time (Gal. iv. 4). On this basis it seeks in the Old Testament in word and in type evidence of fulfilment of promise; consequently the use of the Old Testament in the New can not be regarded as exact exegesis, it is rather instruction in regard to the inner relation of the words of Scripture to the facts which establish the Christian faith (cf. Luke xxiv. 25–27; I Cor. x. 11).

2. Patristic and Medieval Exegesis.

The exegesis of the New Testament alongside of the Old began with its acceptance as canonical, and was practised first among the Gnostics. The type used by them and by their opponents was allegorical, the latter attempting to avoid the wilfulness of the former. Origen was the first great exegete and developed what had been begun by the Alexandrian school (Clement), becoming the "lawgiver and oracle" for subsequent times, drawn upon by Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Rufinus, and Jerome. A turn toward the construction of an ecclesiastical exegetical tradition was taken in the works of Didymus (d. 329), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), Ambrosius (d. 395), and Augustine. The works of the Antiochian school were preserved only in part, and that in excerpts in the catenæ. Of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia only his commentary on the Minor Prophets survives. Other great names are Chrysostom, Basil, the two Gregorys, Theodoret, Ephraem, Isidor of Pelusium, and Ambrosiaster. For the collections which soon began to be made the sources in the Eastern Church were Origen and Chrysostom, and in the Western Augustine and Jerome. For the allegoristic method Gregory I. (d. 604) is the principal model and source. In both East and West the makers of catenæ were many; in the East were Procopius of Gaza and Olympiodorus and Photius, and in the West Isidore of Seville, Bede, Alcuin, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Abelard, and the mystics. In Spain Jewish exegesis was fruitful; besides there was the work of Nicholas of Lyra. Humanism, using closely the text, produced the criticism of the Vulgate by Laurentius Valla, the text and commentaries of Erasmus, and the commentaries of Cajetan and Faber Stapulensis.

3. Exegesis Since the Reformation.

Of the Reformers, Luther did little strictly exegetical work apart from his preaching. Melanchthon's work is scholiastic. Other exegetes were Cruciger, J. Jonas, Brenz, M. Flacius, J. Camerarius, Zwingli (in sympathy with humanism), Œcolampadius, Butzer, and Capito. Calvin commented upon the whole New Testament except the Apocalypse, and also upon the Pentateuch, Psalms, and the Prophets. Besides these Musculus, Bullinger, and Beza (of special importance) are to be mentioned. The exegesis of the Counterreformation made no use of humanistic help, but took a polemic tone against the Evangelical theologians, as in the case of Vatablus and Clarius. Since the middle of the sixteenth century the Jesuits have occupied the field, their representatives being Maldonatus (d. 1583), Salmero (d. 1597), J. Mariana (d. 1624), Lucas of Bruges (d. 1629), Cornelius a Lapide (d. 1637), and the Italian Menochius (d. 1685). The results are summed up in J. de la Haye, *Biblia magna* (5 vols., Paris, 1643), and *Biblia maxima* (19 vols., Paris, 1660). The exegesis of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was bent to the affirmation or denial of "church doctrine," the *Evangelienharmonie* of Chemnitz striking the keynote. For the Lutherans such men as D. Chytræus and Erasmus Schmidt, for the Reformed Church J. Piscator and J. A. Lampe, for the Socinians J. Exell, and for the Pietists Spener and Bengel were the leading exponents. To all parties, excepting to the leaders Luther and Calvin, the Apocalypse seemed a work of great importance and was the object of much attention. With the earnest dogmatic zeal of the Arminians new interest was awakened, and the works of Grotius appeared, and those of his follower Clericus. The new standpoint was partly philological, partly practical. Gleanings were made in the rabbinical field (Lightfoot), in the historical field (Spanheim), in archeology (Cunæus), and in chronology (J. Scaliger). Fruits of these activities were the *Critici sacri* (9 vols., London, 1660), M. Poole's *Synopsis criticorum* (5 vols., London, 1669–76), and J. C. Wolf's *Curæ philologicæ et criticæ in Novum Testamentum* (5 vols., Hamburg, 1741). In the philological-theological school of Ernesti the ecclesiastical character of exegesis was no longer seen. The fundamental question at the beginning of the nineteenth century was the rationalism or the supernaturalism of Scripture. In the second third of that century the recovery of a confessional theology and a deep impression from Hegelian philosophy characterized the work done. Whether any school has made its impress upon the exegesis of the last third of the century, one standing in the midst of the conflict may not decide.

The German exegesis of the nineteenth century is characterized by division into schools which created each its own journal and organ. Thus

there was the confessional school of Schleiermacher, and the reconstructionist school of F. C. Baur, the "new Tübingen school," the advocates of the "restoration-theology" under Hengstenberg, and Lutheran confessionalism under J. C. K. Hofmann. Leaders of a philological exegesis were Gesenius, Ewald, J. Olshausen, and Winer. Baumgarten-Crusius emphasized the religious element and De Wette the critical. C. J. A. Fritzsche, Reiche, and Rückert, using the philological method, strove to free interpretation from dogmatic shackles, and were ably assisted by H. A. W Meyer. The leadership of Ewald was followed by Hupfeld, Hitzig, Bertheau, Knobel, Dillmann, and Graf. The ecclesiastical "restoration-theology" drew as its helpers in this field Hävernick, Delitzsch, Keil, Tholuck, and Lange. The Tübingen school directed its efforts to the reconstruction of the history of primitive Christianity. Independent of this school but somewhat in the same direction were the works of A. Hilgenfeld, H. Lipsius, H. Holtzmann, and C. Weizsäcker. The separation of the new school, which seeks to unite the results of exegesis with those of criticism, is well exemplified in the interpretation of Acts by De Wette as worked over by Overbeck, as well as in the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch,* in the *Handkommentar,* and in the *Kurzer Handkommentar.*

4. German Exegesis in the Nineteenth Century.

This review has sought to present a singular and peculiar religious and philosophical development. The Bible, a book consisting of two collections of writings different in history and in make-up, has proved itself through eighteen hundred years the inexhaustible source of nourishment for faith and support for the soul of Christianity. From its interpretation and application to dogmatic and practical questions arose the theology of patristics. The ecclesiastical and religious needs, changing with the times, resulted in the development of exegetical theories and ever new attempts at an improved and deepened exposition of Scripture. And for the future, given the two facts of God in history and of history as wider than man's folly and man's wisdom, a continually deepening appreciation of the Bible will result in the deepening of life. (G. HEINRICI.)

In French-speaking countries up to a recent date, the critical movement had made small headway. Protestantism in France was a feeble force. It had slight part in the deepest movements of the nation's life. Its colleges were hardly better than country academies. Its vitality exhausted itself in keeping alive. For a long time the fact that France was a near neighbor to Germany counted for little. The life of E. Reuss (1804–91) tells the story of the critical movement in France. He was born in Strasburg. He acquired the critical ideal and methods in Germany. His work was published, part of it in German, part of it in French. *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments* appeared in Halle (1842, 6th ed., 1887, Eng. transl., *The History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament,* London, 1884). An immense and productive activity followed, crowned by the monumental work, *La Bible* (translation, introduction, and commentary, 17 vols., Paris, 1874–81), in the preface of which his lifelong feeling regarding critical scholarship in France is expressed. Renan's great work, *Origines du christianisme* (7 vols. and Index, Paris, 1863–83; Eng. transl., *The History of the Origin of Christianity,* 7 vols., London, n. d.), is in parts extremely weak. An imagination of extraordinary brilliance builds with dangerous facility on the original work of the Germans. But as a whole it is an immense achievement, bringing the New Testament literature into fertilizing contact with the social life and needs of antiquity, and even when resting on hasty exegesis giving impetus and stimulus to deeper work by other men. French Switzerland has given one interpreter of high rank, F Godet (1812–1900). Spiritual discernment, clear judgment, and an admirable expository method characterize his commentaries on the Fourth Gospel and the Pauline Epistles. But the critic in him was imperfectly developed. His weakness on this side betrays itself by the constant intrusion of exegesis into questions of text-criticism, and by tenacious conservatism in the field of introduction.

5. Modern French Exegesis.

Holland presents conditions materially different from those prevailing in France. Protestantism in this land was a national faith. As a religious principle it levied tribute on the deepest forces in the nation's history. Moreover, it possessed great universities, strong both in prestige and in equipment. Here, therefore, the critical mind that took its start from Germany found a field ready for the plow. J. H. Scholten (1811–85), professor at Utrecht, opened the critical movement. He began his theological career by a masterly treatise on the humanity of Christ (1840). His emphasis on this point led him into eager appropriation of the historical view of the New Testament. In his *Historisch-kritische Inleiding tot de schriften des Nieuwen Testaments* (Leyden, 1855) he defended the traditional view. But the critical attack overcame his resistance, and he published his surrender in *Het Evangelie naar Johannes* (1864). From this time on, he became in Holland an increasing force on the side of criticism. His great pupil Abraham Kuenen (1828–91) won his fame in the Old Testament field. But his Old Testament work became, in a way, representative of the recent criticism of the New Testament. Kuenen's scholars carried into the New Testament field the methods which had achieved in the Old Testament field such brilliant success. The history of recent interpretation in Holland shows, more clearly than in any other country, the prodigious influence which the Old Testament scholar is bringing to bear upon New Testament studies. Through his work the modern author has been able to realize that the literary conditions underlying the genesis and growth of the Scriptures are fundamentally different from those surrounding the modern author; that the corporate author rather than the individual author prevails in the Biblical field as a whole, and that corporate interests and hopes

6. Exegesis in Holland.

sometimes play upon and mold the text of sacred books for a long period before they take their final form. Pierson, Loman, Van Manen, and Naber with others constitute what is called the "Holland School." Bruno Bauer had anticipated some of their conclusions. But Bauer's work started from philosophical premises. The "Holland School," on the contrary, starts from sound historical premises. Old Testament methods and achievements have inspired the attempt to explain the Paul of the Pauline Letters as even more a literary than a real personality (like the Moses of the Pentateuch). The prestige of Old Testament study gives the attempt its justification. Parallel study in the field of Homeric criticism and other ancient literatures increases that prestige. The "Holland School" therefore is an important phenomenon for the interpreter of the New Testament. He must not yield to the temptation to sit in the seat of the scornful, but must show by deeper study of the Apostolic Age that the methods which are at home in the Old Testament are to be used with extreme caution in the New Testament field.

7. English Exegesis.

The intellectual leadership of England in the first part of the eighteenth century, the work of high promise in the field of text-criticism, gave reason to expect that the same sequence of thought which brought the higher criticism close on the heels of text-criticism in Germany would operate here. But there was no constructive philosophical movement in England to endow the religious reason with confidence. Instead, a great revival of religion (see Methodists) grappled the Bible, as the traditional theory of inspiration presented it, to the heart of England. Criticism, in breaking through the crust of tradition, had an extremely hard task. A typical exegete, the product of this religious revival, was Thomas Scott (1747–1821). His *Holy Bible* (4 vols., London, 1788–92; see Bibles, Annotated, II., § 8), running through many editions, was the representative English commentary down to Alford's Greek Testament. Sir James Stephen called it "the greatest theological performance of our age and country." This opinion is a good standard by which to estimate the state of interpretation in England. Scott's Bible had great value as a devotional and dogmatic commentary along the lines of Evangelical feeling, but no historical insight. It is sometimes mistakenly said that the critical movement in England broke ground through Edward Evanson (1731–1805), who published *The Dissonance of the Four generally Received Evangelists* (Ipswich, 1792). But Evanson was not a critic. He was an antidogmatic dogmatist. More solid ground was taken by Herbert Marsh (1757–1839), bishop of Peterborough. He issued a translation of Michaelis' *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Bundes* as *Introduction to the New Testament* (4 vols., Cambridge, 1793–1801). In his own work, along the lines of Michaelis, he deserves high credit for the first inquiry in English into the origin of the canonical books. While, however, he provoked wholesale attack, his work had no appreciable results. When the strain of the Napoleonic wars was over and the revival of historical studies began, the Oxford movement turned the entire energy of the Church of England into the channels of ecclesiastical restoration and debate. Charles Lloyd (1788–1829), dreading the effect upon England of the kind of Bible-study that was carrying the day in Germany, urged on his pupil E. B. Pusey (1800–82) the advisability of a course of study in German universities. Pusey was in Germany in 1825 and again in 1826–27. His acquaintance with German scholarship, his labors as a Hebraist, and the subordination of all his scholarship to his vast influence as a churchman made him the most representative man in the English Church. F. D. Maurice (1805–72) brought to the study of the Scriptures an ennobling mysticism and a liberating mind. But as an interpreter he wholly lacked the historical spirit and method. The best preliminary work in Great Britain was done by Samuel Davidson (1806–99), professor at Belfast and Manchester. Frankly acknowledging his debt to Germany, devoting all his energy to Bible-work, he manifested both the initiative and the conservatism proper to a scholar doing a pioneer's work in a difficult field. It is characteristic of the situation that the critical movement should have cleared its main line of approach through the demand for a revised translation. Gathering volume from the middle of the century, and reaching its goal in 1881, it led to the monumental text-work of Tregelles and Westcott and Hort, and threw open the entire field of Bible-study. *Essays and Reviews* (q.v., London, 1860) raised a storm of controversy regarding the established views on inspiration. J. W Colenso (1814–83), bishop of Natal, through his *Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically Examined* (7 parts, London, 1862–79), forced the Pentateuchal question to the front. The notable book by Sir John Robert Seeley, *Ecce Homo* (London, 1865), fixed attention on the humanity of Christ and thus, like the similar work of Scholten in Holland, helped to make the critical study of the Gospels inevitable. Henry Alford (1810–71) published a *Greek Testament* (4 vols., London, 1849–61) which rendered high service to a generation of English and American students, and signalized the immense advance of English interpretation since Scott's Bible. J. B. Lightfoot (1828–1889), bishop of Durham, published commentaries on the Pauline Epistles which combined in an extraordinary degree historical knowledge, exegetical insight, and literary charm. B. F. Westcott (1825–1901), bishop of Durham, in his commentaries on the Fourth Gospel, I John, and Hebrews, combined deep patristic learning with the historical method and spiritual charm. But while, through these and other scholars, Great Britain had created a body of work possessing high interpretational value, it presented an almost unbroken conservative front to the fundamental critical questions. Not until the last quarter of the century did the critical movement invade Great Britain with power. Here, as on the Continent, the Old Testament field was in many ways the proving-ground. The names of W Robertson Smith (1846–94) and of T. K. Cheyne are distinguished. The publishing of the

two dictionaries, the *Dictionary of the Bible* (1899–1904) and the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1899–1903), constitutes an epoch. The *International Critical Commentary* demonstrates that critical methods have at last won their full rights in the field of English interpretation.

8. Exegesis in the United States.

It is easy to understand why the critical movement should have been late in getting under way in America. The country had no inherited culture, no stores of learning, no universities. Population was thinly spread over vast areas. Practical needs exerted an irresistible pressure. The country being intensely Protestant and having few ecclesiastical traditions, the Bible alone and by itself counted for more in the building of the nation than anywhere else in the world. As a result of all these conditions, the established Protestant interpretation of Holy Scripture acquired an immense hold. The revival of religion and missionary interest in the first quarter of the nineteenth century resulted in the founding of a large number of theological schools, beginning with Andover, 1807, which, however, offered no leverage for free and critical thinking. The dominant opinion in the various churches had complete control within the seminaries. Nowhere was critical detachment so hard to achieve. The Unitarian movement, while it exalted reason, made no direct contribution to interpretation. The philosophical movement of New England, coming from Germany and England, endowed the orthodox churches with liberating thought. Horace Bushnell (1802–76) is a typical figure. But the exegesis this movement inspired, like the exegesis of Coleridge and Maurice, lacked the historical sense and method. The prominent theological reviews (e.g., *Bibliotheca Sacra*, *The Princeton Review*) down beyond the middle of the century are almost wholly occupied with dogmatic, devotional, and institutional questions. But the influence of Germany, through translations of German books and through an increasing body of men who had studied in Germany, was steadily growing. The life of Philip Schaff (1819–93) is representative. The Schaff-Lange Commentary, both translation and original work, indicated a rising tide. The part taken by American scholars in the work of Bible revision was another significant sign. The logical sequence of critical Bible-studies has held strikingly true in America. The rapid rise of Old Testament criticism in the last quarter of the century is the notable phenomenon. With the exception of Ezra Abbott (1819–84), distinguished as a text-critic, and Joseph Henry Thayer (1828–1901), noted as a lexicographer, the American names of the first rank have been made in the Old Testament field (Charles Augustus Briggs, Crawford Howell Toy, George Moore, Francis Brown). American scholarship has worked with English scholarship to produce the two Bible dictionaries noticed above and the *International Critical Commentary* above mentioned.

The history of the critical interpretation clearly proves that the great need of the time is patient and thorough exegesis. The constructive imagination, beginning with Baur, has done its work. The New Testament student has before him all the hypotheses that can give facile and imposing synthesis. The task that lies ahead is the deep study of individual documents. This is all the more necessary because the wide gaps in our knowledge of the Apostolic Age make constructive synthesis as tempting as it is dangerous. The other great need is that the student shall be on guard against the personal equation. The critical individual of modern Christianity is not wholly competent to understand the men of the Bible, for whom religion was a superb passion and the corporate life instinctive. He needs also to remember that the distinction between metaphysics and religion, which has become a necessary element of thought, was wholly foreign to the men of the New Testament. The "critical" exegete may be, in some ways, quite as naive as the patristic exegete.

HENRY S. NASH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the history of exegesis: C. A. Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, New York, 1899 (the best single book for the English reader); J. J. Conybeare, *Hist. and Limits of Spiritual Interpretation*, Oxford, 1824; Z. Frankel, *Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, Leipsic, 1851; L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche*, Jena, 1869; S. Berger, *De glossariis et compendiis exegeticis medii ævi*, Paris, 1879; L. Wogue, *Hist. de l'exégèse biblique*, Paris, 1881; F. W. Farrar, *Hist. of Interpretation*, London, 1886 (covers all periods except the very modern); W. Rosenau, *Jewish Biblical Commentators*, Baltimore, 1906 (from the Talmud to the 20th century); G. H. Gilbert, *Interpretation of the Bible; a short History*, New York, 1908.

On the theory, but often including the history, of interpretation: F. Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutik und Kritik*, ed. F. Lücke, Berlin, 1838; H. N. Clausen, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, Leipsic, 1841; S. Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics*, Edinburgh, 1843; C. G. Wilke, *Die Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1843–1844; S. Lutz, *Biblische Hermeneutik*, ed. A. Lutz, Pforzheim, 1849; J. E. Cellérier, *Manuel d'herméneutique*, Geneva, 1852, Eng. transl., *Biblical Hermeneutics*, by C. Elliott and W. J. Harsha, New York, 1881 (covers five varieties of exegesis); A. Kuenen, *Criticæ et hermeneuticæ*, Leyden, 1856; P. Fairbairn, *Hermeneutical Manual*, Edinburgh, 1858; J. J. Doedes, *Manual of Hermeneutics for the New Testament*, ib. 1867; S. R. Bosanquet, *Interpretation*, London, 1874; C. H. Spurgeon, *Commenting and Commentaries*, London, 1876; A. Immer, *Hermeneutik des N. T.*, Wittenberg, 1873, Eng. transl., *Hermeneutics of the New Testament*, Andover, 1877; J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Biblische Hermeneutik*, ed. W. Volck, Erlangen, 1880; M. S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, New York, 1883; E. Reuss, *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des A. T.*, §§ 501–600, Brunswick, 1887, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1884; C. F. G. Heinrici, *II. Korintherbrief*, pp. 552–553, Berlin, 1887; D. R. Dungan, *Hermeneutics*, Cincinnati, 1888; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vols. i.–ii., Leipsic, 1889–92; F. Blass, *Hermeneutik und Kritik*, Munich, 1896; G. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1898; G. A. Deissmann, *Die sprachliche Erforschung der griechischen Bibel*, Giessen, 1898; P. Gennrich, *Der Kampf um die Schrift*, Berlin, 1898; B. Jowett, *The Interpretation of Scripture*, London, 1906.

On special phases of exegesis: C. Maitland, *Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation*, London, 1849; C. D. Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, London, 1865; D. McC. Turpie, *The O. T. in the New*, London, 1868; idem, *The N. T. View of the Old*, ib. 1872; C. Siegfried, *Philo . als Ausleger des A. T.*, Jena, 1875; H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*, Freiburg, 1880; F. H. Chase, *Chrysostom: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*, London, 1887; A. Clemen, *Der Gebrauch des A. T. in den neutestamentlichen Schriften*, Gütersloh, 1895; E. Moviat, *Notion augustinienne de l'herméneutique*,

Paris, 1906; E. Riggenbach, *Die ältesten Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief*, Leipsic, 1907; P. Heinisch, *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese*, Münster, 1908; consult also the literature under CATENÆ; *KL*, iv. 1080–1121, v. 1844–75, and the articles in this work on the scholars named in the text.

EXELL, JOSEPH SAMUEL: Church of England; b. at Melksham (11 m. e.s.e. of Bath), Wiltshire, May 29, 1849. He studied at Taunton and Sheffield Colleges, was ordered deacon in 1881, and ordained priest in 1882. From 1881–84 he was curate of Weston-super-Mare, Somersetshire, and in 1884–90 vicar of Townstall with St. Saviour, Somersetshire. Since 1890 he has been rector of Stoke-Fleming, Dartmouth, Devonshire. He collaborated with Canon H. D. M. Spence in editing *The Pulpit Commentary* (London, 1880 sqq.) and *The Homiletical Library* (1882 sqq.); and with H. D. M. Spence and C. Neil in editing *Thirty Thousand Thoughts, Being Extracts Covering a Comprehensive Circle of Religious and Allied Topics* (6 vols., 1884–1888); he has been editor of *The Lay Preacher* (London, 1875 sqq.) in collaboration with J. E. Hargreaves; and sole editor of *The Study and the Pulpit* (1876–77); *The Homiletic Quarterly* (1880 sqq.); *Heart Chords* (1883 sqq.); and *The Monthly Interpreter* (Edinburgh, 1885 sqq.). To the *Homiletical Library* he has contributed *Homiletical Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (London, 1879) and *Homiletical Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (1885; in collaboration with T. H. Leale); and has also written *Practical Readings in the Book of Jonah* (Peterborough, 1874) and *The Biblical Illustrator* (London, 1887 sqq.).

EXEMPTION: In canon law, the liberation of one or more persons or ecclesiastical institutions from the jurisdiction of the ordinary superior, another, frequently higher, being substituted, especially the pope. These exemptions are allowed to be made only on sufficient grounds, for the good of the Church. Apart from regular papal grant, they may be claimed on the ground of a forty years' unopposed prescription. The oldest and most frequent instances are those of orders or monasteries. Originally all the monasteries of a diocese were subject to the bishop. In the West the strictness of some bishops led certain monasteries to obtain letters of protection either from the bishops or from kings and popes. Papal privileges freeing them absolutely from episcopal jurisdiction, the first of which date from the sixth and seventh centuries, were rare until the time of Gregory V (996–999); but in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they became frequent, and were extended to entire orders, as well as to cathedral and collegiate foundations. The weakening of the episcopal authority and frequent conflicts between bishops and persons enjoying exemption led to complaints, in consequence of which, at the Council of Constance (1418), Martin V. revoked all exemptions from the jurisdiction of the ordinary granted since the death of Gregory XI. (1378); and Leo X. at the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17), among a number of reforming decrees, issued one which considerably limited the system. The evils complained of continued, however, to such an extent that the Council of Trent took up the question, in spite of the protests of the generals of orders who were present. It required regulars to obtain the license of the bishop in order to administer the sacrament of penance or to preach outside their own conventual churches, to publish in these churches censures imposed by the bishop, to observe these as well as the fast-days proclaimed by him, and to take part in public processions. They were to be subject to episcopal jurisdiction and visitation in regard to the cure of souls outside of their own members. The bishops were authorized to take cognizance of any public scandal by regulars, and to punish them in case their own superiors failed to do it. Other duties imposed on them as *ex officio* delegates of the apostolic see were the chastisement of regulars living outside their convents in case of misbehavior; the disciplining of regulars who were incompetent to preach, who preached heresy or scandalous error, or who did not observe the decrees of the Council regarding the mass; the enforcement of strict enclosure on nuns; the annual visitation of the churches of exempt clergy and care for the proper performance of pastoral duties; the introduction into monasteries of systematic instruction in Holy Scripture; and the execution of the Council's decrees on monastic reform.

Canon law distinguishes between passive exemption, which gives the holders of the privilege jurisdiction only over the members of their own community, the churches attached to it, and the laity living within their bounds, and active exemption, which gives the holders a wider and quasi-episcopal jurisdiction. Of these latter are the *prælati nullius* (sc. *diœceseos*), who have power over a definite *territorium separatum*, free from diocesan connection and subject directly to the pope; if these are not bishops, they must, of course, resort to the neighboring bishop for strictly episcopal functions. An analogous case is the exemption of certain diocesan bishops from metropolitan jurisdiction (see ARCHBISHOP), and their subjection directly to Rome. In modern times, also, the military and naval forces of certain countries have been under a military vicar or chaplain-general named by the pope, who usually had episcopal orders (see BISHOP, TITULAR); this has been the case, e.g., in Austria since 1720, and in Prussia since 1868, with a break from 1873 to 1888. There are also exemptions from parochial jurisdiction, either for orders and monasteries, or for specially privileged persons or classes. Somewhat similar exemptions from the authority of the superintendent or consistory still occur in the Lutheran Church of Germany; and there are a number of cases, known as "peculiars," in the Church of England, the most notable being the chapels-royal in London and Windsor, which are under the immediate jurisdiction of the sovereign, and Westminster Abbey, of which the dean is the ordinary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. F. Weiss, *Die kirchliche Exemtionen der Klöster*, Basel, 1893; L. Ferraris, *Prompta bibliotheca canonica*, under "Regulares," Rome, 1844–55; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, ii. 144 sqq., 229 sqq., 335 sqq., 343 sqq., Berlin, 1869; Schäfler, *Der Bischof und Regularen*, Augsburg, 1871; R. von Scherer, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 422

sqq., Graz, 1891; J. B. Sagmüller, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 219 sqq., Freiburg, 1904; *KL*, iv. 1121–26; *DCA*, i, 643; article "Dean" in the theological dictionaries.

EXEQUATUR. See PLACET.

EXERCITIA SPIRITUALIA ("Spiritual Exercises"): A work by St. Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits. Originally written in Spanish, it was translated into Latin and first published at Rome in 1548 with the approval of Paul III. The military asceticism and obedience which characterize the Jesuits are essentially the result of this book, which has promoted the steady growth of the order through the centuries and extended its influence both to the regular and to the secular clergy. In its content the "Spiritual Exercises" is no new creation of its author, but is based on older rules for inward prayer and spiritual meditation, finding close analogues in the works of contemplative mystics of the close of the Middle Ages, such as Jan van Ruysbroeck.

Sources. Among the more immediate sources were probably the *Abecedario espiritual de las circonstancias de la passion de Cristo nuestro Señor y otros mysterios* (1521) of the Minorite Francesco de Osuna and the *Exercitatorium spirituale* (1500) of the Benedictine abbot Garcia de Cisneros. From the former book may have been derived much pertaining to the meditations on the Passion in the "third week" of Loyola's course, while the latter furnished the basis for the threefold way of purification, illumination, and union. Manresa, where Loyola wrote the "Spiritual Exercises," is situated near Montserrat, where the *Exercitatorium* was composed, so that Ignatius doubtless came under the same influences which had inspired De Cisneros. This is shown conclusively by the Benedictine Antonio de Ypez (d. 1621), while the older Jesuits maintained that the *Exercitia* had been miraculously revealed to Loyola at Manresa by the Virgin. Modern Jesuits, however, recognize more or less fully the dependence of Loyola's book on the *Exercitatorium*, although they emphasize the superiority of their founder's work over that of his predecessor both on account of its more practical form and because of the special rules for examination of conscience and care of souls which are lacking in the composition of De Cisneros.

The *Exercitia spiritualia*, which contains besides its main topic, additions, annotations, and instructions, is based upon a series of meditations divided into four weeks. These meditations treat of purification through contemplation of the sinful corruption of mankind, illumination through contemplation of the incarnate and crucified Redeemer, and mystic union with the risen and glorified Savior. The first week, or *via purgativa*, leads to consciousness of sin and repentance for it by five daily meditations on the purpose of man and complete resignation to the divine will, the fall of man and angels, the guilt incurred thereby, and the eternal punishment of hell. In the course of each day one who practises these exercises is required to examine his conscience, and to watch and combat his besetting sins, while in the evening he must review his general conduct during the past day. The *via illuminativa* occupies two weeks. The first half is devoted to meditations on the mysteries of the sending of the Redeemer from the time of his resolve to become incarnate to his Passion, closing with the requirement to choose between Christ and the world. The second half of the *via illuminativa* is devoted to meditations on the Passion, deepening and strengthening the resolve to follow Christ. The fourth week is filled with meditations on the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, wherein he who has died with Christ rises again as a new man united with God. The exercises close with a prayer of absolute resignation to God in Christ in memory, intelligence, and will. Certain ascetic practises are recommended for the promotion of meditation, but these are spiritual, such as the reading of ascetic writings, or frequent confession and communion, rather than fasting, scourging, and the like. To the *Exercitia* are appended certain "rules for harmony with the Church," intended to reconcile one who has gained union with God through the three ways wholly with the cardinal doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, thus guarding him against a heretical mysticism, and at the same time ignoring all teachings outside the Roman Catholic body.

Arrangement.

Through their skilful adaptation to the requirements of Roman Catholic devotions, as well as through their elasticity, which rendered them suitable for use both within and without the Order of Jesus, the *Exercitia spiritualia* proved victorious over the attacks made upon it immediately after its appearance, even by Roman Catholic theologians. The Dominican Melchior Cano aroused opposition against the work in the University of Alcala, and aided the archbishop of Toledo to forbid its use and dissemination in 1551. Yet within a few decades Loyola's book met with the universal approval of the entire Roman Catholic world, including the Dominicans themselves. St. Charles Borromeo had it recommended by a provincial synod of Milan in 1576, while Francis of Sales, Juan and Theresia de Avila, Vincent de Paul, and others lauded it highly. A series of papal bulls sanctioned it, especially after 1593, when the *Directorium* of Aquaviva, the General of the Order, required its use among the Jesuits. In an abbreviated form the *Exercitia spiritualia* was recommended even to non-Jesuits, both clergy and laity. Paul V. granted a plenary indulgence to all who should practise the *Exercises* for ten days (May 23, 1606); Alexander VII. granted similar privileges to the laity for a period of eight days (Oct. 12, 1657); while Benedict XIV reduced this minimum to five days (July 15, 1749), and later even included those who "should pass but a single day under the direction of the Jesuits as a preparation for a good death" (Mar. 29, 1753).

History and Influence.

In this double form of a four weeks' course for members of the Order of Jesus, to be performed at least twice, once during the novitiate and again after the completion of the education, and of an abbreviated course for non-Jesuits, the *Exercitia spiritualia* is in use at the present day and is an

important factor in modern Roman Catholic religious thought and life. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The "Exercises" were published in Eng. transl. from the Latin in London, 1847, 1860, 1870, and from the Spanish, ib. 1900. Consult: P. Stöger, *Die asketische Literatur über die geistlichen Uebungen*, Regensburg, 1850; A. Steinmetz, *Hist. of the Jesuits*, London, 1850; E. Gothein, *Ignaz von Loyola*, pp. 26–36, Halle, 1885; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, ii. 294–295, Bonn, 1885; J. Brucker, *Die geistlichen Uebungen des heiligen Ignaz*, Freiburg, 1890; O. Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum*, pp. 594–599, Frankfort, 1898; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 59–63.

EXILE OF THE ISRAELITES. See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, I., § 9.

EXODUS, BOOK OF. See HEXATEUCH.

EXODUS OF THE ISRAELITES. See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, I., § 4; WANDERING IN THE WILDERNESS.

EXORCISM: The expulsion of evil spirits by conjuration or magical or religious exercises; see DEMONIAC, §§ 4–6; also BENEDICTION; DIVINATION; SACRAMENTALS. This article is confined to exorcism in connection with the rite of baptism.

It is easy to understand how the primitive Church came to use the rite of exorcism on its catechumens; it is also obvious that in so doing it departed from the Scriptural standpoint. Resting its practise on the healing of demoniacs by Christ, it undertook to heal by exorcism a large number of morbid conditions, which it considered of diabolical origin. It had a class of officials set apart for this function, though not originally by any form of ordination; according to the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 26) they possessed a "gift of healing," and their work was thus the exercise of a gift rather than of an office. Their method of treatment included prayer and laying on of hands. In the third century this sort of exorcism was applied to catechumens coming from paganism, on the theory that the pagan world was the realm of evil spirits, and that those who came into the Church from it must thus be delivered from the power of evil. In thus deserting the original ground of exorcism, as an influence brought to bear in order to cure a morbid condition of the psychico-physical organism, for an attack upon the ethical power of the kingdom of darkness over souls, the practise entered upon a career which led toward fantastic magic. Satan was commanded to come forth from the catechumens; and the thought that the winning of each new convert from paganism to Christianity was a manifestation of the victory of Christ over the prince of this world finds dramatic expression in these exorcisms.

The first certain evidence of the employment of exorcism in the case of catechumens is offered by Cyprian in 256; it is found here in use both in the Catholic Church and among heretics, so that it is evidently no new thing. Another mention of it, possibly somewhat older, is found in the *Canones Hippolyti*. It is doubtful whether Tertullian knew of the practise, or whether the Clementine Homilies (iii. 73) intend to refer to it in the description of the daily laying on of hands during the preparation for baptism. At the Carthaginian council of 256 in which it is first clearly mentioned, certain bishops requested that it, together with baptism, should be employed at the reception of heretics into the Church; the reason given, that "heretics are worse than pagans," shows how definitely exorcism was still connected with the thought of paganism. In the same context it is interesting that an early Greek form for the reception of a convert from Judaism contains a renunciation, but no exorcism (Assemani, *Codex liturgicus*, I. 105 sqq.). When exorcism was thus once brought into connection with baptism, it was applied to the baptism of infants in the same unreflecting way as were the other ceremonies originally belonging to adult baptism. As in the service for infant baptism the various liturgical acts of the catechumen's preparation were combined into a continuous function, the various exorcisms which found a place in that were here also included. At the outset came the *exsufflatio*, a thrice-repeated breathing in the face of the child, with the words "Depart from him, thou unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete"; after the giving of salt, there was a long exorcism, three times repeated, each time with a different command to the devil to depart from the child. This remained substantially the same until the end of the Middle Ages. The *Rituale Romanum* of 1614 condensed it considerably, retaining only the *exsufflatio* at the beginning with the last of the three exorcisms and its introduction

Luther saw no objection to the exorcism in the baptismal office, which he retained in his own of 1523, abbreviating it, indeed, but not on any theological ground. In that of 1526 it was further abbreviated, and the *exsufflatio* omitted; but relics of the Roman function passed from this into the majority of the Lutheran service-books, to excite bitter controversy later within the Lutheran ranks, and to be the subject of reproach on the part of the Calvinists. When not forced by such attacks to defend the practise, the Lutheran theologians freely admitted that it was a non-essential, and at the Cassel Conference of 1661 expressed their willingness to change it to a prayer for deliverance from the power of Satan. In the rationalistic period at the end of the eighteenth century, it finally disappeared from one service-book after another, and now, since its general abandonment by the Lutherans, the ceremony has no place in the rites of any Protestant Church.

(G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, III. iv., X. ii. 8; C. Gerber, *Historie der Kirchen-Ceremonien in Sachsen*, Leipsic, 1732; J. M. Krafft, *Historie vom Exorcismo*, Hamburg, 1750; G. T. Strobel, in *Miscellaneen*, iv. 173 sqq., Nuremberg, 1781; F. Höfling, *Das Sakrament der Taufe*, i. 376 sqq., Erlangen, 1846; J. Mayer, *Geschichte des Katechumenats*, Kempten, 1868; F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten*, pp. 16 sqq., 128 sqq., Tübingen, 1872; G. von Zezschwitz, *Katechetik*, i. 286 sqq., 340 sqq., Leipsic, 1872; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 362, London, 1903; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution*, pp. 296, 299, 303, 317, 322, ib. 1904; C. H. H. Wright and C. Neil, *A Protestant Dictionary*, p. 215, ib. 1904.

EXPECTANCY (*Exspectantia, exspectativa, gratia exspectativa*): In canon law, the right of succession to an ecclesiasical office not yet vacant, by virtue of which the person on whom it is con-

ferred succeeds when the vacancy occurs. Such rights first come into notice in the twelfth century. For the purpose of rewarding deserving clergy and scholars, but also, especially later, in order to provide an income or a higher income for officials and favorites of the curia, or to please secular rulers, the popes began in the period named to give letters of commendation to bishops and chapters regarding the bestowal of benefices, whether vacant or not. These soon assumed a mandatory character, and compliance with them was enforced by special officials and by the employment of ecclesiastical censures, the right to issue them having been held since Innocent III. as a part of the papal powers. The resistance of the persons regularly entitled to nominate to such offices brought about the formal reservation of whole classes of benefices to the pope (see RESERVATIONS, PAPAL). To the expectancies described above was added in the fifteenth century the custom of papal nomination of perpetual coadjutors with right of succession, either to avoid long vacancies or contested episcopal elections, or to assure a see to a member of a particular princely house, or, especially in the Reformation period, to a person of assured loyalty to the papal system. Besides expectancies conferred by the popes, another class came up in the thirteenth century, in cathedral and collegiate foundations, varying according to their constitution (see CHAPTER), giving a right to the first vacancy in a limited chapter, or (where the number of canons was not limited but that of prebends was) conferring the title of *canonicus supernumerarius* with a right to the first vacant prebend, or promising both title and prebend at once. Again, expectancies developed from the exercise of the *jus primariarum precum*, according to which from the thirteenth century the emperors, the kings of France and England, and later a number of petty German princes and even empresses and queens of England, claimed the right on their accession or coronation to request from each endowed foundation or monastery in their territory the assignment of a benefice or position, vacant or to be vacated, to their nominees. This claim, based at first on custom, was confirmed by papal indults, and fell into disuse only at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Many of these developments were in direct contravention of the ancient canonical principle which forbade appointments to ecclesiastical offices before they were vacant, and even required evasion of the ruling of the Third Lateran Council of 1179 to the same effect. The process, however, went on until bishops, founders, and monasteries were obliged to protect themselves by special papal indults against the misuse of the practise. The Council of Trent again forbade all kinds of expectancies, only allowing the pope to nominate a coadjutor with right of succession to a bishop or head of a convent in case of necessity. This prohibition has, indeed, been interpreted as referring not to the pope but to other ecclesiastical dignitaries; but practically, in the altered modern circumstances, the matter is no longer of importance. The same thing applies to the Protestant churches of Germany, which at one time allowed expectancies to exist in the bishoprics and chapters that became Protestant at the Reformation or the Peace of Westphalia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, ii. 65, 69, 84, 255, 474, 639, 652, iii. 113, 6 vols., Berlin, 1869–97; J. H. Böhmer, *Jus ecclesiasticum protestantium*, iii. 8, §§ 9 sqq., 4 vols., Halle, 1756–63; H. C. de Senckenberg, *De jure primarum precum*, Frankfort, 1784; A. Mayer, *Thesaurus novus juris ecclesiastici*, i. 249, Regensburg, 1791.

EXSUPERIUS (EXUPERIUS), SAINT: Bishop of Toulouse; d. Sept. 28 (?), year not known. His early life is unknown, but from allusions in Jerome's letters (liv. 11, cxix., cxxiii. 16, cxxv. 20) it has been conjectured that in 394 he was a presbyter at Rome; he was bishop of Toulouse in 404, and in 411 was still living. In 406 Jerome dedicated his commentary on Zechariah to him. Jerome pays a glowing tribute to his self-sacrificing charity during the disturbances in that part of France in 411. From the letters of Pope Innocent I. (*Epist.*, vi.) it appears that in Feb., 405, Exsuperius applied to the pope for advice respecting Biblical and episcopal matters. He completed the basilica of St. Saturninus, begun by his predecessor, Silvius.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *ASB*, Sept., vii. 623–630; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. x.

EXTREME UNCTION.

I. In the Roman Catholic Church.
History (§ 1).
Doctrine (§ 2).
Preparation and Administration (§ 3).
II. In the Greek Church.

Extreme unction is one of the minor sacraments of both the Roman and the Greek Churches.

I. In the Roman Catholic Church: Extreme unction is mentioned as the fifth sacrament by Peter Lombard who brings it into close connection with the sacrament of penance. He

1. History. uses two passages as Biblical authorities, Mark vi. 13 and Jas. v. 14–15. These passages have, however, little to do with the sacrament as developed in the Church of Rome. Extreme unction is not often mentioned in the early Church. Augustine, Chrysostom, and Irenæus speak of it, but do not treat it as a sacrament. Oil was, however, frequently used by Christians in private life, chiefly for the anointing of the sick. Tertullian, for instance, mentions the healing of Severus, the father of the Emperor Antoninus, with oil. Popular superstition soon exploited these experiences, and used the oil in the church lamps. Some bishops, e.g., Chrysostom and Decentius, did not object, but limited the employment to members in good standing. Innocent I. also mentions the anointing of the sick, but not of the moribund; in case a priest was not available, laymen might perform the ceremony. Toward the end of the eighth century extreme unction entered upon a definite course of development, and was brought into relations with remission of sins; it received, consequently, a sacramental character in connection with penance. The question of the repetition of extreme unction was raised in the twelfth century. A popular superstition held that a Christian who, after participation, had been restored to health was to be looked upon as one departed: he was not to touch the ground with bare feet, eat meat, or cohabit with his wife. When Theodulf of Orléans

recommended that the anointing should take place in the church, he had not in mind either exclusively or chiefly the application to the moribund. Hugo of St. Victor (*Summa sententiarum*, vi. 15) was the first theologian to treat extreme unction systematically. He deals, however, only with two questions, the institution and the repetition of the sacrament. From that time on, extreme unction received more detailed attention, particularly by Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas. The latter treats it from two points of view: (1) the sacrament itself, its effect, matter, and form; (2) its administration and use, the recipients, repetition, and parts to be anointed. The principal features of the sacrament were thus fixed, and received ecclesiastical sanction at the Council of Florence (1439) through Eugene IV., and its final and definite form at the Council of Trent.

2. Doctrine.

Extreme unction was instituted according to Peter Lombard by the apostles, according to Alexander Hales by Christ, according to Bonaventura by the Holy Spirit through the apostles, according to Thomas Aquinas by Christ, but was promulgated by the apostles. The Council of Trent declares that, according to Mark vi. 13, Christ suggested the sacrament, and that James, his brother, promulgated and recommended it. The material which is to be used in extreme unction is olive-oil consecrated by a bishop, and, according to a decision of Paul V., given in 1655, the oil is not effective unless so consecrated. Gregory XVI. (1842) confirmed and further limited this decision by declaring that not even in case of extreme necessity could a priest consecrate oil for the purpose. The form of the sacrament was settled only after many discussions. With the growing tendency to look upon anointing as sacramental, the form of prayer was changed from the precatory to the declarative, and this was confirmed by the Council of Florence. The specific purpose and effect of extreme unction is somewhat indefinite. The Council of Trent declares that this sacrament completes not only penance, but the whole Christian life. Nevertheless, it does not occupy nearly the important position in the doctrinal system of the Roman Church taken by baptism, the mass, and penance; it is merely an annex to the latter sacrament to which it gives the character of preparation for death. A specific effect has never been attributed to it officially. Peter Lombard gives as the purpose the remission of sins and the alleviation of physical infirmity. Albert the Great declares that extreme unction could purify only from the remnants of sin which prevent the entrance of the soul into eternal rest. Thomas Aquinas defines these remnants as a spiritual weakness and lassitude which disqualify man for the full enjoyment of the life of grace and glory, and states that extreme unction is a medicine for both. He speaks of physical healing as a secondary effect, taking place when the primary purpose of the sacrament is not hindered but promoted. Bonaventura, on the other hand, teaches that the specific effect of extreme unction is the remission of venial sins which were completely obviated by this sacrament owing to its strengthening effect upon soul and body. The Council of Trent repeated all the positive doctrines of the theologians, and added the doctrine of unction with the Holy Spirit as the specific effect. These differences concerning the effect and purpose of extreme unction were unsatisfactory, and attempts were made at greater precision. The Roman Catechism assumes two effects, the remission of venial sins, and the removal of spiritual weakness and of any remaining traces of sin. Bellarmine, finally, attempts a precise definition of the "remnants of sin"; they are mortal or venial sins which man might commit after penance and the Eucharist; or sins which were not atoned for properly, because sick persons had unwittingly received in an improper manner, and, therefore, without the due effect.

3. Preparation and Administration.

The olive-oil used in extreme unction is consecrated during the mass on Maundy Thursday. Each deanery receives a certain amount for distribution among the parishes. The oil which is not used up within a year, is burned in the sanctuary lamp; if there be danger that the supply will be exhausted before the end of the year, small quantities of unconsecrated oil may be added. Only a priest or higher dignitary may administer this sacrament. Even the pope can not authorize deacons and laymen to do so, although Innocent I. implies that they may in case of necessity. The administrator acts as a representative of the whole Church; and for this reason it is desirable that several priests be present to take part in the ceremony. The regulations concerning the degree of sickness which entitles a person to receive the sacrament vary, but agree in the particular that the probability of recovery is excluded, and that the recipient must be conscious. The oil is to be applied to the eyes, ears, hands, nose, and mouth, and to the abdomen and the feet of males, but not of females. The sacraments of penance and of the Eucharist should as a rule precede extreme unction.

II. In the Greek Church: The usage of the Greek Church differs widely from that of Rome both in methods of administration and in doctrine. There it is simply an anointing of the sick, and its purpose is the restoration of health, physical and spiritual. The place of administration is the church, if possible. The ritual is elaborate, and requires seven priests if they are procurable. The oil is consecrated on each occasion by the senior priest, and each priest repeats the full ceremony while seven selections are read each from the Epistles, Gospels, and collects. On Maundy Thursday the feast of *euchelaion* ("oil of prayer") is observed, in which the whole congregation joins and is anointed. The frequent use of the sacrament is recommended.

The Nestorians never use extreme unction; the Armenian Church has discontinued it.

(F KATTENBUSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the Roman sacrament consult: *KL*, ix. 712-725; E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, i., chap. 7, Antwerp, 1736; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vi. 3, pp. 217 sqq., Mainz, 1831; J. C. N. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, ix. 455 sqq., Leipsic, 1828; J. H. Blunt, *Sacraments and Sacramental Ordinances*, London, 1867; idem, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, pp.

771-773, ib. 1870; F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien*, pp. 373 sqq., Tübingen, 1872; J. H. Oswald, *Die dogmatische Lehre von den heiligen Sakramenten*, ii. 257 sqq., Münster, 1877; M. Heimbucher, *Die heilige Oelung*, Regensburg, 1888; P. Schanz, *Die Lehre von den heiligen Sakramenten*, pp. 639 sqq., Freiburg, 1893; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 363-366, London, 1903.

For the Greek Church consult: W. Gass, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche*, pp. 292 sqq., Berlin, 1872; F. Kattenbusch, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Konfessionskunde*, i. 434 sqq., Freiburg, 1892; A. von Maltzew, *Die Sakramente der orthodox-katholischen Kirche*, pp. cccxxiii. sqq., 450-553, Berlin, 1898; K. Beth, *Die orientalische Christenheit der Mittelmeerländer*, pp. 316 sqq., Berlin, 1902.

EYLERT, RUHLEMANN FRIEDRICH: Evangelical bishop of Prussia; b. at Hamm (20 m. s.e. of Münster) Apr. 5, 1770; d. at Potsdam Feb. 8, 1852. After completing his theological education at Halle in 1794, he became pastor in his native town, and in 1806 was appointed preacher to the court and garrison at Potsdam. Eleven years later he became bishop of Prussia and a member of the council of state as well as of the ministry for religion and education. Far more important than his official activity, however, was the influence which he exercised on Frederick William III. The development of Eylert was from rationalism toward orthodoxy, although he never reached a sure dogmatic position. He was deeply interested in the agenda and in the movement for union, and remained in active service until his resignation in 1844. Eylert was a prolific writer, his chief works being as follows: *Betrachtungen über die trostvollen Wahrheiten des Christentums bei der letzten Trennung von den Unsrigen* (Dortmund, 1803); *Homilien über die Parabeln Jesu* (Halle, 1806); *Predigten über Bedürfnisse unsers Herzens und Verhältnisse unsers Lebens* (1813); *Ueber den Wert und die Wirkung der für die evangelische Kirche bestimmten Liturgie und Agende* (Potsdam, 1830); *Das gute Werk der Union* (1846); and, above all, *Charakterzüge und historische Fragmente aus dem Leben Friedrich Wilhelm III.* (3 vols., Magdeburg, 1843–1846; Eng. transl. *Characteristic Traits and Domestic Life of Frederick William III., King of Prussia*, by J. Birch, London, 1844). He also collaborated with J. H. B. Dräseke in publishing the *Magazin von Fest-, Gelegenheits- und anderen Predigten* (4 vols., Magdeburg, 1816–20).

(August Tholuck†.)

Bibliography: *Neuer Nekrolog der Deutschen*, Weimar, 1852; *ADB*, vi. 458.

EZEKIEL.

I. The Prophet.
II. The Book.
Divisions and Contents (§ 1).
Literary Peculiarities (§ 2).
Symbolic Actions (§ 3).
Other Characteristics (§ 4).
Theological Character (§ 5).
Relation to the Priest Code (§ 6).

I. The Prophet: Concerning Ezekiel, the earliest exilic prophet, his book teaches (i. 2, 3, iii. 15, xxix. 17, xl. 1) that he was the son of Buzi, of priestly descent (through the Zadokites), that he lived by the river Chebar not far from Tel-Abib among the captives whom Nebuchadrezzar had deported with King Jehoiachin, and that he labored there as prophet from the fifth to at least the twenty-seventh year of this captivity (593–571 B.C.). The statement of Josephus (*Ant.* X., vi. 3) that he was still a boy when carried into captivity is not probable, since he was well acquainted with the temple and its service. The river Chebar must not be confused with the Habor of II Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11 (the modern Khabur), which empties into the Euphrates (q.v.) near Carchemish, on which the exiles of the Northern kingdom were settled; it must be sought in Babylonia and is probably the canal Kabaru, not far from Nippur. Ezekiel enjoyed the authority of a prophet among the exiles, and they often sought his counsel though it was generally contrary to their desire, and in secret they gave vent to their wrath (ii. 6). He exercised a pastoral care among his people and formed a spiritual center for those who were cut off from their land and its temple (viii. 1, xiv. 1 sqq., xx. 1, xxiv. 18, xxxiii. 30–31).

II. The Book: The prophecy of Ezekiel, the third of the books of the major prophets in the arrangement of the English Version, was no doubt put in systematic form by the prophet himself; it divides into two main parts which correspond to the two periods in which Ezekiel prophesied. The first (i.–xxiv.) closes with the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar (588 B.C.); the second (xxxiii.–xlviii.) begins after the destruction of the city (586 B.C.). The interval is filled in by prophecies against foreign nations not arranged in strict chronological order (xxv.–xxxii.). Each main part opens with utterances upon the importance and responsibility of Ezekiel's office. The contents vary in a characteristic manner. As long as Jerusalem was standing, the announcement of coming judgment predominated; what had been God's kingdom was to fall utterly; when that had come to pass, the work of reconstruction was to begin. "While in the first half Ezekiel buried the material hope of Israel, which rested on the continued existence of Jerusalem and the Temple, in the second he rebuilt in spirit land and people, city and temple" (Klostermann). Pronouncement of judgment on the world-nations formed the transition to the establishment of the theocracy in Israel; the episode belongs therefore to the second part.

1. Divisions and Contents.

The literary peculiarities of Ezekiel's book are connected with his position as an exile during its composition. He differed from the earlier prophets, even from his older contemporary Jeremiah, by being removed from the actual theater of history, thus being denied an immediate influence in the developments of his time, and this affected the form of his oral and written speech. His prophecies were no casual addresses to fit passing events, but were worked out in quiet meditation and prepared with literary art, for which he had an evident liking. Not that the short, striking, oracular utterance is wholly wanting; but Ezekiel more often discusses his subject at leisure and his deliverance develops deliberately before his prophetic eye (compare the detailed description of his first vision—chap. i.—with the brief sketch of the similar vision in Isa. vi.). He is not satisfied with

2. Literary Peculiarities.

a few characteristic strokes, but rather aims at a perfect picture which affects the spectator less by its immediate power and warmth than by its grandeur and harmonious finish. The frequency of the visions attests also his inclination toward quiet meditation. That he could not come into immediate contact with the concrete objects may, furthermore, have helped to cause the figurative descriptions which are peculiar to him. His contemporaries complained of his figurative speech (xx. 49), and the enigmatic character of his writing has always tried the patience of Jewish as well as Christian interpreters, while it has yielded the richer material to mysticism. Figurative utterance is found in Ezekiel in various forms—now as simple metaphor, now approaching the parable (xv.; xxii. 18 sqq.), now as true allegory (xvii.). He delights especially in personifying nations and countries or in representing them under the image of animal or plant. Thus he portrays Judah (Jerusalem) and Samaria as prostitutes (xvi., xxiii. 1 sqq.); the house of David as a lion's den (xix. 1 sqq.), or a vine (xix. 10 sqq.; cf. xvii. 6), or a cedar (xvii. 3); Egypt as a cedar (xxxi. 3 sqq.), or a crocodile (xxxii. 1 sqq.); the Chaldean power as a great eagle full of feathers of diverse colors (xvii. 3). After giving the meaning of his cryptic utterances, he again takes up the allegoric form. He shows himself a master in describing the great and sublime, and some portions of his book are specimens of the most beautiful and the most tender lyric poetry—e.g., the elegies, characteristic of him as of Jeremiah, in which he laments the lot of the foreign powers (xix. 1 sqq., xxvi. 17 sqq., xxvii. 2 sqq., xxviii. 12 sqq., xxxii. 2 sqq.). To consider Ezekiel only a writer, however, who did not actually deliver his addresses, is not admissible; but it is true that the written form was of special importance to him, particularly as his spoken words could benefit only a small part of his people.

3. Symbolic Actions.

Once again, Ezekiel's position, his exclusion from all share as an active participant in the events of his time, was accountable for the symbolic actions with which he accompanied his discourses and made them impressive. His whole person was called on to serve his oracles in most varied pantomime. Dumbness (iii. 26), motionless constraint (iv. 4–8), eating and drinking (iv. 9 sqq.), cutting of the hair (v. 1 sqq.), stamping with the foot and clapping of hands (vi. 11), sighing (xxi. 11), and trembling (xii. 17) were all made "signs." What happened to the prophet was emblematic of the fate of his people (xxiv. 14 sqq.); in his own person he represented also that of his king (xii. 3 sqq.). Partly because of the triviality of such symbolic signs it has been denied that they were actually employed, and they have been regarded as mere literary devices. But considering Oriental skill in interpreting such symbols and the readiness of the Israelites to attach importance to the acts of a prophet, actual performance is the more natural assumption, though vii. 23 and xxiv. 3–5 are probably parables. In other cases a mere recital of what happened to the prophet would have lacked significance and contributed little as illustration. But what an impression it must have made when people found him in the condition described in iv. 1 sqq. with hostile look directed for weeks on Jerusalem and with arm uplifted against it! The picture was a most eloquent epitome of the fate of the city. Klostermann attempts to make the long immobility of the prophet more intelligible by finding here the symptoms of severe catalepsy. Dumbness, indeed, seems to have been imposed on the prophet, to judge from expressions which can not be referred to mere silence (cf. iii. 26–27, xxiv. 27). Such a disease might be considered a means God-ordained for prophetic purposes.

4. Other Characteristics.

To the solemnly ceremonial style of Ezekiel belongs also the stereotyped recurrence of certain solemn formulas. The sayings are generally introduced by "thus saith the Lord Yahweh" (117 times according to Zunz) or "the word of Yahweh came unto me." The prophet is always addressed by God and the angels with the elsewhere unusual name "son of man"; and many other recurring phrases give the book a uniform cast. Like Jeremiah, Ezekiel draws frequently from former prophets. His muse is inspired by the entire sacred literature of the past, especially by the "Mosaic" law, but also by sacred history and tales of prehistoric times (cf., e.g., Gen. ii. 8 and Ezek. xxviii. 13; Gen. i. 28 and Ezek. xxxvi. 11). Beside this is his artistic realism, which everywhere produces concrete forms from the material furnished by the historical, archeological, and literary store of the theocracy. He was no mere "scholar," as he has been called, but rather a creative genius who made his knowledge of the past useful for new ideas. His sentences are involved, often diffuse, and his language is more Aramaized than that of Jeremiah; but the clumsiness of expression in Ezekiel's book is partly due to corruption of the text, which in many passages can be corrected from the Septuagint.

5. Theological Character.

Passing to the spiritual significance and theological character of Ezekiel, he has marked points of contact with Jeremiah, who remained in Jerusalem. Both declare with all emphasis the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth to be unavoidable and near at hand, destroying relentlessly the illusory hopes of the patriots and strongly condemning the fraudulent policy of the princes who were trafficking with Egypt. The Levitical character of Ezekiel's prophecies, which portray the city of God and its cultus under a new régime and in its details, springs from his sacerdotal education and disposition. The Levitical side of Ezekiel in recent times has been exaggerated in two ways. In the first place it is asserted that he was the originator of the priestly legislation with its tabernacle, its orders of sacrifices and priests. In the second place he is charged with having pushed aside or destroyed by his formulas and outward injunctions the free ethical religion of the prophets, becoming the father of the bigoted postexilic Judaism and Pharisaism. It is true that for Ezekiel, as for the Mosaic law, external order and ethical communion with God are inseparably connected. He

regards it as highly important that the holiness of God be preserved by the ceremonial purity of his ministers and by the exclusion of the profane. But chap. xviii., which exhibits Ezekiel's ethics, puts beside the first command, to worship God only, the other which is like unto it, to love one's neighbor, and emphasizes the truth that every one is judged by God according to his personal conduct. A parallel passage is found in xiv. 14 sqq. But how little the prophet expected salvation from mere formal fulfilment of commandments is shown by xi. 19–20, xxxvi. 26–27; complete obedience is the result of a new heart written over with God's law, which the Lord is to give with a new spirit (cf. Jer. xxxi. 33), so that regeneration and sanctification appear as God's work. With Ezekiel the glory of God was the highest good. The people's misfortune was a just punishment for great guilt. Future salvation, however, was to come not because of man's merit (xxxvi. 22), but for the sake of God's name. This sovereign God was not arbitrary or cruel; his will purposed the conversion and life, not the destruction, of his sinful people (xxxiii. 11). The awakening of the congregation to new life is exhibited in a hopeful allegory (xxxvii.). The Davidic royalty was again to be established. David, the servant of the Lord, i.e., a future heir of the mind and power of David, was to rule his entire people in the name of his God (xvii. 22 sqq., xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24). Ezekiel does not stop with the portrayal of a favored ruler from this family; he describes in detail a last attack by the heathen world upon the law of Yahweh already announced by former prophets. In this whole delineation the relation to Joel is to be observed (cf. C. v. Orelli, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, Munich, 1896, p. 43). The closing vision (xl.–xlviii.) has no connection with these other prophetical utterances. The description of the new temple is not merely a sketch for its reestablishment. The seer is raised above existing conditions. On the other hand, his sketch and his arrangement are well considered and are so clear that one can as easily make a sketch of Ezekiel's as of Solomon's temple. The question of the priority of Ezekiel to the Priest Code reenters here. Popper and Graf, breaking with tradition, declared the conception of the Mosaic tabernacle (Ex. xxvi.–xxvii. and xxxvi.–xxxvii.) to be later than Ezekiel's picture of the temple and they are followed by most of the critics. There are some, however, who with equal confidence advocate the preexilic origin of the Priest Code. A close relationship exists between the earlier addresses of Ezekiel and the so-called Law of Holiness (Lev. xvii.–xxvi.). Graf and Kayser consider the prophet the author of the latter, which Klostermann has exhaustively shown to be wrong. He prefers to consider this law a kind of catechism in use among the exiles, which the prophet also followed. Bäntsch also, though following Graf in the main, comes to the conclusion that a large part of the Law of Holiness was prior to Ezekiel and was used by him as a basis of his discourses. This being admitted, the same should also hold good for the rest. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain how later men imitated the prophet's style, but boldly opposed his revelations. Baudissin by an impartial comparison arrives at an essential affirmation of the priority of the Law of Holiness and the Priest Code (apart from Lev. xvi. which may be a later interpolation). Dillmann considers the Law of Holiness as much older than Ezekiel, which however (especially Lev. xxvi.) was revised during the exile with the use of Ezekiel's utterances. The main argument for the opposite view is found in xliv. 6–13, according to which only the Levitical priests of the house of Zadok are the priests proper; the Levites, however, who had worshiped in the high places, were to perform the lower functions. Here may be perceived the first distinction between classes of Levites. In Deuteronomy such a difference does not exist; the door to the sanctuary at Jerusalem was open for the priests of the high places (Deut. xviii. 6 sqq.). In the Priest Code, however, the sharp distinction between priests and Levites is traced back to Moses; Ezekiel stood between. But it must be remembered that Ezekiel nowhere stated in what respects the new temple was to resemble the present or differ from it. But he certainly censures as a transgression of the covenant, and as a breach of Mosaic order that strangers should perform the lower temple services. This supposes that that order provided for other temple servants, no doubt Levitical (see Levi, Levites). Another obvious difference is that Ezekiel does not mention the high priest. But from this it can not be certainly inferred that the prophet did not know the office and that in the preexilic period a head of the priesthood did not exist. History proves the contrary. His silence may be explained from the same point of view as the fact that in place of the preexilic king he puts a modest prince (xliv. 3 sqq.). It is possible that xxi. 26 sqq. is an afterthought, where it is said: "Remove the diadem, and take off the crown." The prophet presupposes an ancient ordinance traced back to Moses (xx. 10–11, xliv. 7–8), according to which he reforms depraved practise, but with prophetical liberty he is not afraid to change ordinances to prevent future abuses or to give a purer expression to the spiritual idea. That Mosaic ordinance is nothing else than the Priest Code, whose directions Ezekiel intensifies in many points in the interest of the holiness of God. It is therefore untenable that he is the lawgiver who created this legislation. It must not be forgotten that he established neither a complete code nor one serving for an immediate use; as a teacher of the Mosaic law he could therefore move more freely in order to emphasize those things which served his prophetic purpose.

6. Relation to the Priest Code.

C. von Orelli.

Bibliography: The best text is by S. Baer, with Assyriological notes by Friedrich Delitzsch, Leipsic, 1886, cf. C. H. Toy in *SBOT*, 1899. Commentaries are by H. Ewald, Göttingen, 1841; F. Hitzig, Leipsic, 1847; P. Fairbairn, Edinburgh, 1851; E. W. Hengstenberg, Berlin, 1867, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1869; C. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1868; E. Henderson, Edinburgh, 1870; G. Curry, in *Bible Commentary*, vol. vi., London, 1876; R. Smend, Leipsic, 1880; C. von Orelli, Munich, 1896; A. B. Davidson, in *Cambridge Bible*, 1892; J. Skinner, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1895; A. Bertholet, Tübingen, 1897; R.

Kraetzschmar, Göttingen, 1900; P. Schmalzl, Vienna, 1901; C. M. Cobern, New York, 1901; H. A. Redpath, London, 1907. For questions of criticism consult: C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipsic, 1886; H. Graetz, *Emendationes*, vol. ii., Breslau, 1893; D. H. Müller, *Ezechiel-Studien*, Berlin, 1894; T. K. Cheyne, in *Critica Biblica*, London, 1903. Various phases are treated in: J. J. Balmer-Rinck, *Des Propheten Ezechiel Gesicht vom Tempel*, Basel, 1858; B. Bäntsch, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz*, Erfurt, 1893; A. Bertholet, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Hesekiel*, Freiburg, 1896. More personal are C. H. Cornill, *Der Prophet Ezechiel*, Heidelberg, 1882; H. Meulenbelt, *De Prediking van den profet Ezekiel*, Utrecht, 1888; L. Gautier, *La Mission du prophète Ézéchiel*, Lausanne, 1891. Consult also *DB*, i. 814–820; *EB*, ii. 1456–72.

EZION-GEBER (EZION-GABER).

See ELATH.

EZRA.

His Powers as a Royal Commissioner (§ 1).
His Principal Acts and Methods (§ 2).
His Joint Activity with Nehemiah (§ 3).
Opposition and Final Success (§ 4).

Ezra, postexilic leader of the Jews and lawgiver, was through his ancestor Seraiah (II Kings xxv. 18) connected with the Aaronic line (Ezra vii. 5). Doubtless this relationship induced him to acquire that familiarity with the law of Moses by reason of which he is called "a ready scribe" (verse 6), which can mean only that he had so mastered its principles and provisions that he was able to give answers on points submitted for his decision. It was Ezra's purpose to bring this law into authoritative application to practical life, a thing which could be done only in the independent community in Judea. He therefore put himself diligently to the study of the law so as to set forth in Israel what belonged to duty and order. Evidently Ezra had gained in the senate of the Diaspora a position of authority as an expert in the written law like that which Zadok had gained under other conditions as a priest-prophet (II Sam. xv. 27). It was only through the authority thus gained as the one man acquainted with the law that he could urge the king (Artaxerxes I.) to grant him his mission, which had to do with political as well as religious conditions. So that he was commissioned to "inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem" (Ezra vii. 14), and "to appoint magistrates and judges" (verse 25) and to execute judgment upon all who were disobedient to the law of God and of the king (verse 26). He was also commissioned to carry the royal gifts and those of the nobility and to draw from the king's treasury other sums up to a specified limit for the reestablishment of the temple service. Such powers are conceivable only in case he was recognized as the trusted representative of the Jews regarded as a religious community apart from the state. This relation influenced the permission of the king for all Jews who wished to accompany Ezra on the return to Jerusalem. But the religious side of his mission most concerned Ezra, and by this he was so engaged that he refused to ask an escort from the king (viii. 22). When he arrived at Jerusalem (458 B.C.) he appeared not only as the king's representative; he was the leader of a reenforcement of the Jewish community amounting to 1,600 males and the means of bringing rich gifts. So that his coming meant the material strengthening of the Jewish commonwealth and the conveyance of the king's favor. The way in which he went to work demonstrated that he was concerned not to act according to arbitrary and selfish ends, but was there to follow the recognized order of procedure.

1. His Powers as a Royal Commissioner.

The record of the doings of Ezra after his coming to Jerusalem given by himself possesses great accuracy and completeness, as even the mutilated Hebrew text indicates. He evidently delivered the gifts of the king to the appointed authorities, and the firman of permission to the Persian representatives in the land. There are traces also of a census of the Jews already settled there, for his next task was to investigate the condition of the Jews as a community. The first discovery was that the practise of intermarrying with the heathen round about had been so common that it had invaded even the priestly families. It is characteristic of the man that he did not deal with this matter as the representative of royal authority but as a religious leader, reminding them of their duty to the God who was recalling the nation from death to a renewed life. His pleadings were effectual, and the local leaders of the people were induced to join with him in the movement to purify the community from the evil into which it had fallen. A commission was created to look after the matter, and the business was completed within three months (Ezra ix. 1–x. 17).

2. His Principal Acts and Methods.

It is a matter of regret that neither in the memoirs of Ezra nor in the words of the author is there any information concerning the twelve years between the event last narrated and the coming of Nehemiah. On the one side it is clear that the man whose mission was to restore to honor the house of God and who had brought with him a host of those expert in the direction of the services would not be a laggard in the matter of the organization of affairs so important to the community and in attempting to bring the practise of the people into accord with the religious ideals. In accordance with the commands given him, he found as a prime necessity the awakening in the community of the sense that the norms of conduct were expressed in the law. On the other hand it is admitted that it was after Nehemiah had come from the king as a prince and with military escort, had with strong hands seized the reins of direction and had overborne the opposition which developed, that the full achievement of the desires of Ezra was accomplished. The explanation of this doubtless is that Ezra purposely abstained from appealing to his own authority and from decreeing and ordaining the changes which he wished to bring about by awakening the popular conscience. Another side of the explanation is the opposition which was naturally aroused on the side of the heathen, and of a part of the community itself. The very rigor of the separation enforced between Jews and heathen did much to sharpen the opposition and

3. His Joint Activity with Nehemiah.

even to strengthen the enemy. It is not improbable that the attempt to stop the building of the walls of Jerusalem which was denounced as the antecedent of political revolt had some connection with the reform in the marriage customs of the Jews. And the reports of Nehemiah have something to say about a secret agreement of priests and Levites with the opponents and of an antipathy which had been aroused. It is indeterminable whether under the stress of opposition and hindrance Ezra was temporarily absent from Jerusalem, or whether he definitely limited himself to the service of those whose allegiance came willingly until the arrival of Nehemiah, or whether these two men had come to an understanding as to the methods to be employed. At any rate, it is clearly stated that Ezra and Nehemiah were united in the work of the restoration of the law at the celebration referred to in Neh. viii. 8 sqq. It was only after repeated effort that the law-book was established (in 444 B.C.) as the authoritative guide of the people in the feast lasting seven days, which is recorded in Neh. viii.–x. The one thing which stands out is that Ezra's recourse was not to force and authority, but he awaited, as did Zerubbabel and Joshua, the voluntary submission of the community to the demands of the law itself. And in the institution of the law as the norm of action, he created a close bond between the home community and the Jewish diaspora. Whoever considers with unprejudiced mind the reports by Ezra and about him can not doubt that for him and his companions and for the circle to whom he came, the book of the law, considering its full effect, must have been an authority of long standing. The citations which appear in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah and the references in the prayers establish that what is there adduced is practically the Pentateuch. But even that the Pentateuch was not wholly in its present form in the time of Ezra is disclosed, according to some scholars, by the tax of the half shekel of Ex. xxx. 13 which must belong to a later time than the third of a shekel of Neh. ix. 33. It is to be noticed, however, that a difference should be made between the desires and the possibilities of an oppressed people, which may account for the earlier tax.

4. Opposition and Final Success.

Out of the curiously embellished recollection of the epoch-making service of the real Ezra and from the fact that after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the Jews and Samaritans remained strictly separate communities, and that the Samaritans possessed the law in the old character while the Jews had it in the square character, many of the statements concerning the traditional form of the books of the law have originated. Some of these attribute the newer form to Ezra, others to Ezra and the Great Synagogue, who affixed the punctuation (Neh. viii. 8), and others assert that since the law had been forgotten by the Jews Ezra had come from Babylon and reestablished it *de novo*.

(A. KLOSTERMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the literature given under EZRA AND NEHEMIAH, BOOKS OF, *DB*, i. 820–821; *EB*, ii. 1473–78; *JE*, v. 821 sqq.

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH, BOOKS OF.

I. Transmission of the Text.
1. The Arabic Version.
Ezra Based on the Septuagint (§ 1).
Nehemiah a Revised Syriac (§ 2).
2. The Syriac Version.
3. The Greek Version.
Its Fidelity to the Hebrew (§ 1)
The Corrections Traced to Their Source (§ 2).
4. The Latin Version.
5. The Hebrew Text.
II. Composition of the Books.
Analysis of the Books (§ 1).
The Sources Employed (§ 2).
The Author's Purpose (§ 3).

I. Transmission of the Text.—1. The Arabic Version: In the London Polyglot the two books bear the title "First and Second Books of Ezra the Priest," and there are indications that the two books were translated by different hands. This is substantiated by the fact that Ezra was translated from the Septuagint and Nehemiah from the Syriac. As a result, the text is untrustworthy. But while misunderstanding of the basal text is frequent and mistakes are numerous, it is clear that the Septuagint was by the translator regarded as authoritative, especially the recension represented by the Alexandrine and Vatican codices, particularly by the former.

1. Ezra Based on the Septuagint.

The text of Nehemiah is much shortened, and that this is not due to gaps in the exemplar before the translator is shown by his especial dislike for the lists of names; e.g., Neh. vii. 6–72 is omitted for the stated reason that it duplicates Ezra ii., and for the names given after Pashhur (Neh. x. 3) to xii. 27 he substitutes "and the remainder of their company," and similar omissions occur in the lists of the builders in chap. iii. as also in chap. xii. 33–34, 41. The traces of origin from the Syriac are exceedingly numerous, consisting not merely in the transference of renderings peculiar to that version but in construction and arrangement and in misunderstanding of the original text. To these must be added the fact that the Arabic has errors which can be explained only from a misreading or misunderstanding of the Syriac. Yet it must be remarked that in the passages in Nehemiah which have parallels in Ezra, the Arabic translator of the former was influenced by the Arabic of the latter.

2. Nehemiah a Revised Syriac.

While the principal dependence of the translator of Nehemiah was the Syriac, there are evidences also of other influences. This is shown by the form the name Geshem takes in ii. 13, by the departure from the Syriac text in the corrupt passage iv. 23, by agreement with the Septuagint against the Syriac in vi. 18, by the late form of the word "Siloam" in iii. 15, by the probability that "Bethlehem" in iii. 14 is derived from the Greek *Bethacham* (for Hebr. *Beth-Hakkarem*), and by the fact that in xii. 39 "strong-gate" (for Hebr. "fish-gate") misreads the Greek *ischuran* "strong" for *ichthuran* "fish." There appears in a number of cases reference to the original Hebrew, often accompanied by true exegetical insight, correcting the sometimes senseless reading of the Syriac and of the Septuagint. Such a case is presented in the literal rendering of the Hebrew "behind their backs" (ix. 26), and another in iv. 10 in the rendering "The heart of the Jews was bold and the

bearers of rubbish were many, but we could not build." So an attempt is made to improve on the Syriac rendering of xiii. 24 by translating "spake half Hebrew, half Aramaic, according to the language of the heathen." The Arabic translation has therefore a mixed character and varying worth.

2. The Syriac Version: Here the printed text is often untrustworthy. An arbitrary change is made in pointing "kingdoms" as plural in Neh. ix. 22 against all the witnesses, while *Ndamyah* is read for Hebrew *Yramyah* and Syriac *Nramyah* in Neh. xii. 34. Similar mistakes appear in Ezra vii. 5–6, viii. 1; Neh. iv. 23, and elsewhere. Instances occur, however, in which the original Syriac is corrected after the Hebrew text, as in Neh. viii. 15–16 in the alteration of the words "when they heard" to "that they should hear"; while in Neh. ii. 13 the Syriac "hill-fountain" is a slip of the pen for "dragon-fountain." But the Syriac has also a preference for the ending "-el" instead of "-yah" in names compounded with the name of God, e.g., in Neh. xii. 26 "Nehemiah" appears as "Nehemel." Double translations also occur, as in Ezra ix. 7; also paraphrases instead of translations as in vii. 9, 28, viii. 18, 31. The rendering is not consistent, the same word in the original being translated by different words in different passages. Parallels in other books of the Bible are drawn upon for illustration by way of paraphrase, as when Num. xiv. 4 is employed in Neh. ix. 17 Misunderstandings of the original are numerous; as when the place-name Addan is translated "at that time" (Ezra ii. 59), or "the tower of the furnaces" is displaced by "the neglected tower" (Neh. iii. 11), while the figure of "shaking the lap" in Neh. v. 13 is totally misapprehended. The word "servants" presented such difficulties for the translator that he translated it at one time "sons" (Neh. v. 16), at another time as a proper name (Ezra ii. 58), though in the parallel to the last passage (Neh. vii. 57) he translated correctly.

3. The Greek Version: There are many indications that the work of the translators Aquila and Theodotion have been embodied in the text of the Septuagint. But the character of the translation in the two books is so different that evidently two hands have done the work. Nehemiah often shows a strong feeling for the Septuagint method of rendering as opposed to that of Aquila, as when in ix. 7 all the manuscripts read for "Ur of the Chaldees" "the land of the Chaldees." This tendency is obscured both in Swete's text and in Lagarde's; and unfortunately Swete's undertaking to give the text of codex B as the groundwork of his text is not consistently carried out, a fault which is somewhat mitigated by the giving of notes which enable one to correct the text. Lagarde's text is especially full of errors, particularly such as seem due to oversight in proof-reading. A comparison of the texts of codices A B with S from Ezra ix. 9 on shows that in the first there is an endeavor to reproduce the Hebrew or Aramaic with so great fidelity that regard for Greek grammar has often gone by the board, and when even that would fail, the original is transliterated. This attempt at fidelity is especially notable in proper names, as when *Sōmorōn* is read instead of the usual Greek form *Samareia*. A further result of this comparison shows that the three codices go back upon a common exemplar. This conclusion is not vitiated by the differences which exist between these codices, since many of them are explicable by mistakes of the eye and the ear, by dittography, or omission caused by catching the same word in a passage further along. And further, the archetype of these three codices must have exhibited the qualities noted, especially an intelligent and well-directed desire for a faithful reproduction of the Hebrew and Aramaic text. Many of the changes in the individual codices are due to attempts to correct and make intelligible the strange combinations brought about by this desire for fidelity.

1. Its Fidelity to the Hebrew.

Of this class are the corrections noted by Tischendorf and Swete in the St. Petersburg codex, and the source of these corrections has been discovered in a manuscript seen by Pamphilus. These corrections are seen at their best in Neh. xi., in which the gaps are filled in which made of the Greek text a mere torso, and in Neh. xii. where only the first of the four classes of priests were given. So that the extant Greek text has reached its present condition through processes of smoothing, of correction by comparison with the original and through glosses which have been incorporated into the text. Under the Lucian text must be seen the text of Origen, and into the latter were taken the additions of Theodotion. In this way can be explained the differences between the Lucian text and that of the manuscript of Pamphilus.

2. The Corrections Traced to Their Source.

In the Greek, as in the Syriac, there are numerous double renderings, explainable on the ground of glosses brought into the text, a notable case of which is found in which "nor we" is introduced before "kept thy law" (Neh. ix. 34.) Sometimes the lengthened text is due to a comparison of a parallel text or to reference to a passage which was thought illustrative.

4. The Latin Version: This exemplifies very much the same errors in transmission as have come to light in examination of the other versions. Inconsistent translations of the same expression occur (cf. Neh. xii. 31, 40 with verse 38). On the other hand Jerome renders by the same expression different words (cf. Neh. viii. 7 and 11, *silentium faciebant*). And apparent lacunæ are filled in to make the Latin construction complete. He did not follow blindly the instruction of his Jewish teachers, often following the Greek; sometimes rendering mistakenly, as when he wrote *de igne Chaldœorum* for "Ur of the Chaldees." But his main reliance was the Hebrew text and the Greek versions which came nearest to it. Sometimes he combined in a conflate reading the rendering of two versions, as in Ezra i. 11, where the readings of Lucian and the Septuagint are united. Occasionally where a word was ambiguous, two possible renderings are presented (Neh. v. 10 b, 11 b).

5. The Hebrew Text: The foregoing study of the versions gives as a result the greater value of the Hebrew and Aramaic, though the errors are numer-

ous. For errors and omissions in the text the pseudo-Ezra is sometimes serviceable (Ezra v. 15). Many of the lacunæ in the text are evident, and occasionally the evident completion of the sense may be gathered from the context (Ezra iii. 12–13). It is quite likely that the lacuna between Ezra iv. 23 and 24 is not to be laid to the charge of the author, but to carelessness or to arbitrariness on the part of copyists. That changes have taken place in the person of the verb, particularly from the first to the third, is one of the matters of which note must be taken in a critical discussion of the text.

II. **Composition of the Books:** This is understood both by the arrangement of the material and by its nature. The one book Ezra-Nehemiah is the second half of a large work, of which I and II Chronicles are the first half. The divisions of Ezra-Nehemiah are Ezra i.–vi., vii.–x., Nehemiah i.–xiii. These three parts are constructed on the same plan, each narrating the story of a return of the Jews under special authority and with grants from the Persian kings under Zerubbabel and Joshua, Ezra and Nehemiah, and telling the weighty consequences for the temple community in the Holy Land. There resulted the completion of the temple, the restoration of the public service, the binding together of the community by prohibition of foreign marriages, the securing of political independence of the neighboring peoples through completion of the wall of the repeopled capital, and adoption by the community of the law-book of Moses (Ezra vi., x.; Neh. iii. sqq., viii.).

1. Analysis of the Books.

These results are interwoven into the history of the times. The first step was taken under Cyrus and continued under Darius, the second in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, the third in the twentieth and thirty-second year of the same Artaxerxes. The Persian succession was well known to the author, who in Ezra iv. 5–7 names successively Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes. During that period fell the decrees which were the legal basis of the Jewish community and the contests the successful issue of which consolidated that community and impressed upon it a distinctive character. The seventh year of the Artaxerxes of Ezra vii. can not be regarded as the seventh year of an Artaxerxes who lived some sixty years later under whom the events of Neh. i.–xiii. happened. Nor may it be held that the author dealt with fictitious dates and decrees. Such suspicions are excluded by the quality of the material, which the writer has brought together and made to serve his purpose. The books are a mosaic. The author doubtless obtained the list of the returning exiles from the Books of the Kings of Israel and Judah. He also employed the "Memoirs" of Ezra, those of Nehemiah, and a reputed report of Tabeel and his companions (Ezra iv. 7) directed to Artaxerxes. Here the Masoretic text is the result of a complete misunderstanding. The author of it made out of the original "with the permission of Mithredath" the series "Bishlam, Mithredath," producing a triple authorship for a document which is only referred to and not given, since the document in Ezra iv. 11–16 is specifically stated to be by others (verses 8–9). It is to be noted also that iv. 12 refers to the building of the city and iv. 24 to the building of the temple, and that if the traditional theory were correct, the author would have confused entirely different events and blended the accounts as though they referred to one and the same thing. Similarly out of the reports of Nehemiah, narrated in the first person, the writer built up a story in which seven successive steps in the progress of the work of rebuilding the wall appear, which is a reconstruction by the Chronicler of the order of events as they probably lay in the original documents. Into this is woven an account of the introduction of the law-book, explained by the union of efforts by Ezra and Nehemiah for that purpose. This part is probably taken as an excerpt from the memoirs of Ezra.

2. The Sources Employed.

In defense of the author's stylistic method it must be remembered that he was writing for his contemporaries, probably using documents stored in the Jewish archives; that he was not concerned with historical matters of detail the interest in which is great to moderns; and that he had a comprehensive view of the whole work of restoration of the Jewish commonwealth, which he put forward in the shape of a mosaic the joining of which is not always close and the parts of which are not well coordinated. It was his idea to set forth that as the Samaritans of the time of Zerubbabel hindered the work commanded by Cyrus, so they continued their attempts at hindrance in the days of Artaxerxes. He desired in his notes of time (Ezra vii. 1; Neh. i. 1, ii. 1, viii.–xiii.) to indicate the cooperation of Ezra and Nehemiah in the work. The question has been raised whether the narrative as it stands is the result of wilful perversion of the sources, or of misunderstanding, or whether it conforms to the facts. Nehemiah reports that to him had come sad accounts of the ruinous state of the walls and city of Jerusalem; the apology of Tabeel narrates that the work of reconstruction had been prohibited and forcibly prevented through a denunciation to the Artaxerxes who sent Jews back to Jerusalem. But who could be so influential and so secure in bringing about the restoration of Jerusalem as those who had come with letters missive from the king directed to the accomplishment of this task of restoration? The general outline of history as made out by the author agrees with the facts as presented by his sources.

3. The Author's Purpose.

(A. Klostermann.)

Bibliography: Texts are issued by S. Baer in the Baer and Delitzsch series, Leipsic, 1882; in the Polychrome Bible, by H. Guthe, New York, 1901; and a new text is by M. Löhr in the new *Biblia Hebraica* begun by R. Kittel, Leipsic, 1905. The best commentaries are by J. D. Michaelis, Frankfort, 1720; C. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1870, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1873; G. Rawlinson and others in *Pulpit Commentary*, 1880; E. Bertheau and V Ryssel, Leipsic, 1887; H. E. Ryle, in *Cambridge Bible*, 1893. Discussions on special topics are: R. Smend, *Die Listen der Bücher Esra und Nehemiah*, Basel, 1881; A. van Hoonacker, *Néhémie et Esdras, nouvelle hypothèse sur la chronologie*, Gand, 1890; idem, *Néhémie en l'an 20 d'Artaxerxes I. et Esdras en l'an 7 d'Artaxerxes II.*, ib. 1892; idem, *Zorobabel el le second temple*, ib. 1892; idem, *Nouvelles études sur la restauration juive*, Paris, 1896 (a reply to Kosters, be-

low); P. H. Hunter, *After the Exile*, Edinburgh, 1890; G. Rawlinson, in *Men of the Bible Series*, London, 1891; W. H. Kosters, *Het Herstel van Israel*, Leyden, 1893; A. H. Sayce, *Introduction to . . . Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther*, London, 1893; idem, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, ib. 1894; E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, Halle, 1896 (cf. J. Wellhausen in *GGA*, 1897, ii. 89 sqq.); C. C. Torrey, *Composition and Historic Value of Ezra and Nehemiah*, in *ZATW*, Giessen, 1896; T. K. Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, New York, 1898; P. W. H. Kettlewell, *Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, London, 1901; E. Schrader, in *TSK*, 1867, pp. 460–504; idem, *KAT*, i. 294–297; *DB*, i. 821–824; *EB*, ii. 1478–1488. Consult also the works on the history of Israel and on introduction to the Old Testament, especially Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 507 sqq.

EZRA, NON-CANONICAL BOOKS OF. See APOCRYPHA, A, IV., 1; PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, II., 7–8 F.

F

FABER, fā'ber, **BASILIUS:** Teacher and writer; b. at Sorau (56 m. s.s.e. of Frankfort), Lower Lusatia, c. 1520; d. at Erfurt 1575 or 1576. He studied at Wittenberg after 1538; was private tutor in the house of Johannes Spangenberg, preacher in Nordhausen; then rector of the Latin school in that place; and later held a similar position at Frankfort, and from 1557 to 1560 at Magdeburg. For the next ten years he directed the abbey school at Quedlinburg. On account of his refusal to subscribe the *Corpus doctrinæ Philippicum*, he was dismissed on Dec. 5, 1570; and the following year he was called to the new Latin school at Erfurt, where he remained as head of the *Alumnat*, until his death.

Faber's influence was great, both through his pupils (among whom were men like Cyriacus Spangenberg and Johannes Caselius, qq.v.) and as author. His grammatical works enjoyed great acceptance; likewise his *Libellus de disciplina scholastica* (Leipsic, 1572, 1579); but above all the *Thesaurus eruditionis scholasticæ* (1571 and often), which was intended to be more than a mere dictionary,—a veritable treasury of helps to a knowledge of the Latin tongue and the interpretation of the Latin writers. It was repeatedly revised and was used even into the eighteenth century. As theologian, Faber was a devoted supporter of Luther and his doctrine; he translated into German Luther's commentary on Genesis, chaps. i.–xxv.; was collaborator in the first four "Magdeburg Centuries" (q.v.); and wrote certain edifying, in part eschatological works. He also issued in 1563 a German edition of *Saxonia*, by Albert Krantz (q.v.).

GEORG MÜLLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, I. xl. 2, pp. 12–13, Leipsic, 1844; *ADB*, vi. 488–490; J. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, ed. L. Pastor, vii. 56 sqq., 220, Freiburg, 1893.

FABER, fē'ber, **FREDERICK WILLIAM:** English Roman Catholic; b. of Huguenot ancestry at the vicarage of Calverley (5 m. w.n.w. of Leeds), Yorkshire, June 28, 1814; d. at the Brompton oratory, London, Sept. 26, 1863. He studied at Balliol College, Oxford, and won the Newdigate prize in 1836 for his poem *The Knights of St. John*. He was made fellow of University College in 1837 and was ordained priest in the English Church in 1839. In 1842 he accepted the rectory of Elton, Huntingdonshire. In Oxford he became an ardent admirer of John Henry Newman and an earnest advocate of the Tractarian movement (see TRACTARIANISM). The greater part of the years from 1840 to 1844 he spent with a pupil on the Continent, and during this time his feelings changed with reference to the Roman Catholic Church; his impressions are recorded in *Sights and Thoughts in Foreign Churches and among Foreign Peoples* (London, 1842). He visited the Continent in 1843 with the distinct purpose of observing Roman Catholicism and furnished with letters from Cardinal Wiseman. His *Life of St. Wilfrid* (London, 1844) showed clearly his Roman tendencies, and in 1845 he abjured Protestantism and was reordained in 1847. He formed a religious society at Birmingham with the name Brothers of the Will of God, and again visited the Continent, being received at Rome by Gregory XVI. In 1848 he joined the Oratory of St. Philip Neri in London (see PHILIP NERI, SAINT) and in 1849 became head of the congregation, remaining in this position till his death. He was created D.D. by Pius IX. in 1854.

Faber and Keble were the chief religious poets of the Oxford movement and the former's permanent fame rests upon his hymns, which are marked by fervid piety and grace of language. The most beautiful, perhaps, are "O gift of gifts, O grace of faith" (from a longer poem, *Conversion*), "Workman of God, O lose not heart" (from *The Right Must Win*), and "Paradise, O Paradise." He was a prolific author of religious and devotional works, including *An Essay on Beatification, Canonization, and the Processes of the Congregation of Rites* (London, 1848); *The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri* (1850); *The Blessed Sacrament* (1855); *Lives of the Canonized Saints and Servants of God* (42 vols., 1847–56, continued by the brothers of the Oratory); *Devotional Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects*, ed. J. E. Bowden (2 vols., 1866). His hymns were first published in a small collection in 1848, enlarged editions appeared in 1849 and 1852, and the final edition (150 hymns) in 1862.

D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. E. Bowden, *Life and Letters of F. W. Faber*, London, 1869, new ed., 1888; F. A. Faber, *Brief Sketch of the Early Life of F. W. Faber*, ib. 1869 (by his brother); S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 506–508, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 361–362; *DNB*, xviii. 108–111.

FABER, GEORGE STANLEY: English controversialist, uncle of Frederick William Faber (q.v.); b. at Calverley (5 m. w.n.w. of Leeds), Yorkshire, Oct. 25, 1773; d. at Sherburn Hospital, near Durham, Jan. 27, 1854. He studied at University College, Oxford (B.A., 1793; M.A., 1796; B.D., 1803), and was fellow from 1793 to 1803, when he became his father's curate at Calverley. In 1805 he received the vicarage of Stockton-upon-Tees, in 1808 the rectory of Redmarshall, and in 1811 that of Long Newton, which he held till 1832.

when he was made master of Sherburn Hospital. In 1830 he was given a prebendal stall in Salisbury Cathedral. His voluminous works, devoted largely to prophecy, belong to the apocalyptic school of Biblical interpretation and are now of little importance. To be mentioned are, *Horæ Mosaicæ* (Oxford, 1801), Bampton Lectures delivered in 1801; *The Origin of Pagan Idolatry* (3 vols., London, 1816); and *The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy* (3 vols., 1828).

Bibliography: A *Memoir* by his nephew, F. A. Faber, is prefixed to an edition of *The Many Mansions*, London, 1854. Consult also: *Gentleman's Magazine*, May and June, 1854; G. V. Cox, *Recollections of Oxford*, p. 203, London, 1870; *DNB*, xviii. 111–112.

FABER, fā'ber, **JOHANNES:** The name of three Roman Catholic theologians of the sixteenth century.

1. **Johannes Faber of Augsburg** was born in the second half of the fifteenth century at Freiburg, and died c. 1530; the place of his death is unknown. About 1515 he was prior of a Dominican monastery at Augsburg, and in 1516 was instructor in theology at Bologna, but was soon appointed court-preacher and confessor of the Emperor Maximilian I. At the recommendation of Erasmus he became court-preacher to Charles V., and sought to further a policy of mediation in the Lutheran controversy. Erasmus seems later to have become hostile to him. The only writing known to have been composed by him is a funeral oration over Maximilian (Augsburg, 1519). (J. A. Wagenmann†.)

Bibliography: J. Echard and J. Quetif, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 80, Paris, 1721; C. Khamm, *Hierarchia Augustana chronologica, tripartita*, i. 306, Mainz, 1709; *KL*, iv. 1170–1171.

2. **Johannes Faber of Leutkirch** was born at Leutkirch (40 m. s. of Ulm) in 1478, and died at Baden (12 m. s.s.w. of Vienna) May 21, 1541. He studied theology and canon law at Tübingen and Freiburg, and was successively vicar and rector at Lindau, rector of Leutkirch, and canon and episcopal official at Basel. In 1518 he was appointed vicar-general of the diocese of Constance and received the title of prothonotary from Pope Leo X. The course of events forced him gradually to break with such humanists and Reformers as Erasmus, Œcolampadius, Zwingli, and Melanchthon, and to change from their friend to their opponent. He disapproved of the preaching of indulgences by Bernhardin Sanson in Switzerland, and was in communication with Zwingli (1519–20) and even with Luther, while his condemnation of Eck was undisguised. A radical change took place in his attitude, however, and though he had not yet broken with Luther, he was planning polemics against him and Carlstadt in 1519. His attitude was strengthened by a journey to Rome in the autumn of 1521, when he dedicated to the new pope, Adrian VI., his *Opus adversus nova quædam dogmata Lutheri* (Rome, 1522). Faber returned to Germany a firm opponent of the new movement. On Jan. 29, 1523, he attended the disputation of Zurich as a delegate of the bishop of Constance, but was unable to prove the doctrines of the mass or the invocation of saints either from the Bible or tradition to the satisfaction of Zwingli and his adherents. In the same year he attended the Diet of Nuremberg, where he seems to have met the Archduke Ferdinand, and in 1524 he was a delegate of his bishop at Regensburg, where he and Eck were the chief representatives of the projected Counterreformation. At the same time he republished his polemic against Luther under the title *Malleus in hæresin Lutheranam* (Cologne, 1524), and was invited to the court of Ferdinand as chaplain, counselor, and confessor. In September of the same year he took part in the heresy trial of Kaspar Tauber at Vienna, and was later employed in various affairs of state, endeavoring in 1525 and the following years to win the Roman Catholic cantons of Switzerland from France to Austria, and acting as ambassador to Spain and England in 1527 In 1528 he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Wiener-Neustadt (now St. Pölten), and in the following year became provost of Ofen. He was active in promoting the Roman Catholic cause, taking part in the burning of Balthasar Hübmaier (Mar. 10, 1528), defending the execution in his anonymous *Ursach warum Balthasar Hübmaier verbrannt sei* (Dresden, 1528), and urging the theological faculty of the University of Vienna to action against Lutheran heresy. As the court-chaplain of Ferdinand he attended the Diets of Speyer and Augsburg. On the death of Johannes de Revellis in 1531, Faber succeeded him as bishop of Vienna, and was also administrator of the diocese of Neustadt until 1538. In the midst of his episcopal duties, rendered doubly difficult by Protestantism and Turkish invasion, he found time to establish an institution for impoverished theological students and to attempt to improve the university and theological faculty of Vienna. He was an author of note, his works including, in addition to those already mentioned, *De Moscovitarum religione at juxta mare glaciale religio* (Basel, 1526) and *De fide et bonis operibus* (Cologne, 1536). (Emil Egli.)

Bibliography: A collection of his smaller polemical writings appeared, Leipsic, 1537; another collection, principally of polemical works, 3 vols., Cologne, 1537–41. Consult: C. E. Kettner, *De J. Fabri vita scriptisque*, Leipsic, 1737; J. Echard and J. Quetif, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 111, Paris, 1721; R. Roth, *Geschichte der . . . Reichsstadt Leutkirch*, i. 200, ii. 90 sqq., Leutkirch, 1872; A. Horawitz, *J. Heigerlin*, Vienna, 1884; *KL*, iv. 1172–75.

3. **Johannes Faber of Heilbronn** was born at Heilbronn (26 m. n. of Stuttgart) about 1504, and died at Augsburg after 1557. He was a Dominican of the monastery of Wimpfen and was educated at Cologne at the expense of his city. He was later called to Augsburg as preacher at the cathedral and was a zealous opponent of the Reformation. The most of his writings are polemics against Protestantism and include the following: *Ricardi Pampolitani Anglo-Saxonis enarratio in Psalmos* (Cologne, 1536); *Quod fides esse possit sine caritate* (Augsburg, 1548); *Enchiridion bibliorum* (1549); *Fructus quibus dignoscuntur hæretici* (Ingolstadt, 1551); *Testimonium Petrum Romæ fuisse* (Antwerp, 1553); *Der rechte Weg* (Dillingen, 1553); *Was die evangelische Mess sei* (Augsburg, 1553); and *Johel in Predigten ausgelegt* (1557).

(J. A. Wagenmann†.)

Bibliography: J. Echard and J. Quetif, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 161, Paris, 1721; J. N. Mederer, *Annales Ingolstadiensis Academiæ*, Ingoldstadt, 1782; P. I. Braun, *Geschichte der Bischöfe von Augsburg*, Augsburg, 1813–15; *KL*, iv. 1171–72.

FABER, PETRUS. See Favre, Pierre.

FABER (FABRI), STAPULENSIS, JACOBUS (JACQUES LEFÈVRE D'ÉTAPLES): The most prominent among the men who in the beginning of the Reformation in France prepared the way for Calvin and Farel, at the same time a promoter and renovator of the genuine Aristotelian philosophy, founder of a better exegesis of Holy Scripture, and translator of the Bible; b. at Étaples (120 m. n.n.w. of Paris), Picardy, c. 1450; d. at Nérac (65 m. s.e. of Bordeaux), Béarn, 1536. Nothing is known of his family or of his youth except that he was ordained priest and came early to Paris, attracted by his love of knowledge. Here he devoted himself earnestly and zealously to classical studies. Jerome of Sparta became his teacher in Greek, and with him, as well as with Paulus Æmilius of Verona, Faber lived in intimate intercourse, although his Latin style and his knowledge of the Greek language were always very defective. He became teacher, and in 1492 traveled to Italy, where he sojourned in Florence, Rome, and Venice, studying Platonism and works of mystics, but chiefly Aristotle. Returning to France he renewed his activity as teacher in Paris, with a clearer insight. He became professor in the college named after its founder, Cardinal Lemoine, and exerted an influence beyond the lecture-room by intimate intercourse with gifted students and by Latin translations of the Church Fathers and introductions and commentaries on works of Aristotle. He inspired respect and love by his extensive knowledge, his talents as a teacher, his piety, modesty, and gentleness, and found numerous admirers and friends. When Guillaume Briçonnet (q.v.), his former pupil, was made head of the famous Benedictine abbey of St. Germain des Prés (1507), he appointed Faber librarian, and they lived together until 1520. About this time, Faber, already more than fifty, laid aside secular studies, and devoted himself to the Bible. Two critical essays on Mary Magdalene which he published in 1517 and 1518 gave the Sorbonne occasion for an accusation of heresy; and Natalis Beda (Noël Bédier), syndic of the theological faculty of Paris, had the book formally condemned by a decree of the faculty, Nov. 9, 1521. Beda, who suspected a secret Lutheran in Faber, wanted to institute further proceedings against him, but was prevented by the interference of Francis I. and Marguerite of Navarre. In 1520 Faber had to leave Paris and gladly followed an invitation of Briçonnet to come to Meaux as director of the hospital for lepers. In 1523 the bishop appointed him vicar-general. After the battle of Pavia (1525), the captivity of the king gave Faber's opponents opportunity to proceed more severely against the adherents of so-called Lutheranism, and a special commission was appointed by parliament to investigate the heresies in the diocese of Meaux. Several preachers who had been installed by Briçonnet, were arrested; others recanted; Faber fled with his friend Gérard Roussel (q.v.) to Strasburg, under the pseudonym of Peregrinus, early in Nov., 1525. After the return of Francis I. to France, both were recalled. Faber even became private tutor of the king's children and lived as librarian in the royal castle at Blois. As conditions grew more menacing for the adherents of the Reformation, the Queen of Navarre took Faber to her residence in Nérac, where he spent peacefully the remainder of his long and active life. Faber fully avowed the principles of the Reformation, but externally remained in the Roman Church, hoping that the renovation of the Gospel might be effected without rupture with papacy, and being unequal to an open battle with hostile powers.

Faber's theological productions may be divided into two classes — editions of Church Fathers and mystical writers, and translations and commentaries on Holy Scripture. The first result of his Biblical studies was his *Psalterium quintuplex* (1509). The preface to his commentary on the Pauline Epistles is remarkable because Faber here propounded the principles of the Reformation, five years before the Wittenberg theses of Luther. He maintained the authority of Holy Scripture and the unmerited grace of redemption, combated the merit of good works, the celibacy of priests, and discussed the necessity of a reform of the Church. In 1522 appeared his commentary on the four Gospels and in 1525 on the Catholic Epistles. Here he first discovered the errors of the Vulgate and by his exposition of the text prepared the way for a better exegesis. The Bible is for him the only rule of faith, and he is not afraid of offending against the dogmas and usages of the Church. At the instance of the king and his sister, Briçonnet induced Faber to translate the New Testament into French. The translation was made from the Vulgate and appeared at Antwerp in 1523; the Psalms followed in 1525. In Blois Faber prepared a French translation of the whole Bible (1530), which became, at least for the New Testament and the Apocrypha, the basis of R. Olivetan's translation of the Bible (1535) sanctioned by the Reformed Church of France (see Bible Versions, B, VI., § 3) and so very useful. (G. Bonet-Maury.)

Bibliography: The best sources for a life are Natalis Beda, *Annotationes in Fabrum et Erasmum* (c. 1526); Guillaume Farel, *Epistre à tous Seigneurs* (c. 1548); Theodore Beza, *Icones*, Geneva, 1580, and A. B. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, i. 3–4, 89, 132, 158–216, Paris, 1878. Later works are: K. A. Graf, in *ZHT*, 1852, parts 1–2; De Sabatier Plantier, *Lefèvre d'Étaples*, Montauban, 1870; J. Bonnet, *Récits du xvi. siècle*, Paris, 1875; H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots*, vol. i., chap. ii., London, 1880. On his Bible consult: P. Quiévreux, *La Traduction du Nouveau Testament de Lefèvre*, Paris, 1894; A. Laume, *La Traduction de l'Ancien Testament de Lefèvre*, ib. 1895.

FABIAN, fē'bi-an: Pope Jan. 10, 236—Jan. 20, 250, martyr in the Decian persecution. In the *Chronicon Paschale* he is called Flavian, while the Coptic *Synaxarium* terms him Palatian. According to Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, vi. 29), he was chosen to succeed Anterus because a dove descended from heaven and lighted on the head of Fabian, a bishop who had been summoned to Rome with others to elect

a new pope. Fabian was pope during the reign of Philip the Arab. Origen addressed to him a treatise defending his teachings, while Cyprian mentions a letter written by Fabian with regard to Privatus, a heretic (and probably bishop) of Colonia Lambesitana in Numidia. Macarius Magnes speaks of Fabian as a worker of miracles, and names him together with Polycarp, Irenæus, and Cyprian. Cyprian occasionally mentions this pope with respect, but the ordinances of Fabian in the three letters of the pseudo-Isidore and the twenty-one decrees of Gratian are forgeries.

Though few details are actually known concerning Fabian, it is clear that he was one of the most important popes. His reign was in a period of extraordinarily rapid development of the Church, for it was the time in which the Gnostic heresies, the Christological controversies, and the schism of Hippolytus were crushed, when penance increased rapidly, when the city of Rome was divided into seven or fourteen parishes, when the minor clergy was formed into five grades, and when the temporal power of the Church was greatly augmented. In all these measures Fabian must have been the leading spirit. It was due to him, moreover, that the Decian persecution found a far more sturdy power of resistance in Rome than in Carthage, and that the Roman Church was able to maintain so honorable a position in the year which elapsed between the martyrdom of Fabian and the election of his successor, Cornelius. (A. Harnack.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 148–149, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 27; R. A. Lipsius, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe*, Kiel, 1869; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, i. *Clement of Rome*, London, 1885; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 648, II. i. 144 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 23–24; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 82.

FABRI, fā'brî (*not* **Faber**), **FELIX:** German Dominican; b. at Zurich 1441 or 1442; d. at Ulm Mar. 14, 1502. He belonged to a distinguished family, and in 1465 entered the Dominican order at Basel. He studied theology and was sent to Ulm in 1477 or 1478 as lector and preacher. From early childhood he desired to visit the Holy Land, and his longing was increased by pilgrimages to Aix-la-Chapelle in 1468 and to Rome in 1476. He first visited the East in 1480, but remained only nine days in Jerusalem. In 1483–84 he made a second journey of longer duration, visiting Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine, as well as Mount Sinai and Egypt in company with four Swabian noblemen. Except for frequent trips in behalf of his order, such as his visits to Venice in 1486–87, he spent the remainder of his life as a teacher and preacher in his monastery at Ulm, though he was also a preacher in neighboring nunneries. His works, which are mostly unpublished or lost, show keen observation, piety, sincerity, and humor, though they are marred by their lack of critical acumen, while their Latinity is strongly monastic. Nevertheless, he is the most important and instructive of the pilgrims of the fifteenth century. His chief works are as follows: *Evagatorium in Terræ Sanctæ, Arabiæ et Ægypti peregrinationem* (ed. C. D. Hassler, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1843–49; Eng. transl., *The Wanderings of Felix Fabri*, in *Publications of Pilgrims' Text Society*, vols. vii.–x., London, 1897); *Eigentliche Beschreibung der Hin- und Wiederfahrt zum heiligen Land* (Frankfort, ? 1556); *Gereimtes Pilgerbüchlein* (ed. A. Birlinger, Munich, 1864); and *Historia Suevorum* (partly edited by M. Goldast, in *Suevorum rerum Scriptores*, Frankfort, 1605, Ulm, 1727). The most important portions of the *Descriptio Sueviæ* were published by H. Escher, in *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte*, vi. 107–202 (Basel, 1884), while G. Veesenmeyer has edited the *Tractatus de civitate Ulmensi* (Stuttgart, 1889). *Die Sionspilgerin* is partly printed in *Verhandlung des Vereins für Kunst und Altertümer in Ulm und Oberschwaben*, new series, i. 30 sqq.

G. Bossert.

Bibliography: An early account is: Häberlin, *De vita, itineribus et scriptis Felicis Fabri*, Göttingen, 1742; J. Echard and J. Quetif, *Script. ordinis prædicatorum*, i. 871, Paris, 1721; O. Lorenz, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, i. 91, 106, 209, 347, Berlin, 1887.

FABRI, FRIEDRICH GOTTHARDT KARL ERNST: German theologian; b. at Schweinfurt (22 m. n.n.e. of Würzburg) June 12, 1824; d. at Würzburg July 18, 1891. He was educated at Würzburg, Erlangen, and Berlin, and in 1846 entered the seminary for preachers at Munich. In 1848 he was appointed municipal pastor and instructor in a technical school at Würzburg, and then published his first work, *Die materiellen Notstände der protestantischen Kirche Baierns* (Nuremberg, 1848), which was followed by his *Ueber Armut und Armenpflege* (1851). In 1851 he became pastor at Bonnland near Würzburg, and while there published his *Ueber Kirchenzucht im Sinn und Geist des Evangeliums* (Stuttgart, 1854), in which he deprecated public admonition and excommunication. He first became widely known, however, by his *Briefe gegen den Materialismus* (1855), a criticism of the theories of Darwin and Lyell. From 1857 to 1884 Fabri was president of the Rhenish mission at Barmen. He successfully opposed the denominational strife which threatened to disrupt the organization and raised the educational standard for those who were to go to the mission-field under the auspices of the society, making the preliminary course two years and the seminary training four. The candidates gained both in number and in ability, and branch schools were erected for younger pupils in Barmen (1856), Stellenbosch (1860, 1865), and Gütersloh. Under his auspices the mission increased from twenty-nine stations, thirty-five missionaries, and 6,600 converts in 1857 to forty-seven stations, sixty-four missionaries, and 25,800 converts in 1884. In 1866 he founded the general conference for missions, which henceforth convened triennially, and in connection with missionary activity he wrote *Die Entstehung des Heidentums und die Aufgabe der Heidenmission* (Barmen, 1859) and *Der sensus communis das Organ der Offenbarung Gottes in allen Menschen* (1861). In 1865 Fabri established a committee for German Protestants in southern Brazil, which was enlarged in 1883 to comprise all Protestant Germans in America. He was also keenly interested in inspiring the Greek Church with a spirit of Evangel-

icalism, as was shown by his *Mitteilungen aus Mazedonien* (Elberfeld, 1877).

The political events of 1866 presented unexpected ecclesiastical problems to Prussia which Fabri sought to solve in his *Die politischen Ereignisse des Sommers 1866* (Barmen, 1866), a work followed by his *Die politische Lage und die Zukunft der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland* (1867), *Die Unions- und Verfassungsfrage* (1867), *Staat und Kirche* (1872), and *Kirchenpolitisches Credo* (1872). In Jan., 1871, he was summoned to Strasburg on account of the ecclesiastical situation which had arisen there, and he gladly obeyed, successfully seeking to secure independence for the Evangelical Church of Alsace-Lorraine. In the same spirit he later wrote: *Wie weiter? Kirchenpolitische Betrachtungen zum Ende des Kulturkampfes* (Gotha, 1887).

By his *Bedarf Deutschland der Kolonien?* (1879) Fabri gave the first impulse to the colonial movement in Germany, proposing the foundation of agricultural and mercantile colonies. A number of associations were accordingly formed, and the course of events proved the wisdom of his counsels, of which his last work, *Fünf Jahre deutscher Kolonialpolitik* (1889), gave a final survey. On Oct. 2, 1889 he was appointed honorary professor in the Evangelical theological faculty of Bonn.

(E. Sachsse.)

Bibliography: Sources for a life are the *Akten der rheinischen Missionsgesellschaft in Barmen;* L. von Rohden, *Geschichte der rheinischen Missionsgesellschaft*, Barmen, 1888; and the *Nachrufe* in *Berichte der rheinischen Missionsgesellschaft* for 1891, p. 260, appearing in *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift*, 1891, p. 477.

FABRICA ECCLESIÆ: Literally "a church building," but used as the technical name of that portion of the funds appropriated for the maintenance of the building. At first a part of the general revenue was set aside for this purpose, but later this was kept up only in case of cathedrals and collegiate churches, where a special *magister* or *procurator fabricæ* had charge of the fund. The difficulty, however, of obtaining the means necessary to maintain church buildings led to the formation of special fabric-funds in ordinary parishes, which became the object of many rules and regulations according to custom and local law. The provision of church utensils and the requirements of divine service, especially the lighting, were also included. There was no general regulation as to how the fund should be provided; usually it was made up from oblations, tithes, burial-fees, and the like. The fabric-funds have had special importance in France and the adjoining German lands on the left bank of the Rhine, where they were allowed to continue when the church property was confiscated (decree of Apr. 22, 1790) and have occasioned much subsequent legislation. See Church-Building, Taxation for.

FABRICIUS, fa-brish'i-us, **JOHANN:** German theologian; b. at Altorf (13 m. e.n.e. of Nuremberg) Feb. 11, 1644; d. at Königslutter (9 m. w.n.w. of Helmstadt) Jan. 29, 1729. He studied theology at Helmstadt (1663–65), and then traveled extensively, especially in Italy, where he was preacher to a congregation of Evangelical merchants at Venice. In 1677 he accepted a call to a professorship at Altorf, but twenty years later went in the same capacity to Helmstadt, where he became abbot of Königslutter in 1701 and counselor of the consistory in 1703. His specialty was comparative symbolics, and to this was devoted his most important work, *Consideratio variarum controversiarum* (Helmstadt, 1704). In this book, however, he displayed a latitudinarianism which exposed him to severe criticism; and his position became still more difficult when he pronounced a formal opinion, prepared at the request of Duke Anton Ulrich and based on elaborate arguments, that the Princess Elizabeth Christine might conscientiously become a convert to the Roman Catholic faith to wed the King of Spain. This brought upon him a storm of opposition from the court-chaplains, but their arguments were refuted and they were deposed, while Fabricius and the duke were supported, on the whole, by the ruling of the theological faculty of Helmstadt and a number of other scholars. He then finally succeeded in overcoming the religious scruples of the princess, and her conversion took place at Bamberg on May 1, 1707. In the previous year he had published anonymously a pamphlet entitled *Erörterte Frage Herrn Fabricii, dass zwischen der augsburgischen Konfession und katholischen Religion kein sonderlicher Unterschied sei* (Helmstadt [ē], 1706). Throughout the Protestant world, and especially in England and Holland, the most violent indignation was excited, and the elector of Hanover, moved by his hopes of gaining the English crown, obliged Anton Ulrich to deprive Fabricius of his professorship. He accordingly resigned in 1709, but remained abbot of Königslutter, and occupied the closing years of his life in beautifying his estate and preparing his *Historia bibliothecæ Fabricianæ* (6 vols., Wolfenbüttel, 1717–24).

(G. Uhlhorn†.)

Bibliography: Sources for a life are found in his own work last mentioned above. The subject is treated in the *Geschichte der Dogmatik* by W. Gass, ii. 183, Berlin, 1857, and in G. Frank's *Geschichte der Theologie*, ii. 226, Leipsic, 1865. Consult also J. Beste, *Geschichte der braunschweigischen Landeskirche*, pp. 334–346, Wolfenbüttel, 1889.

FABRICIUS, JOHANN ALBERT: German theologian and bibliographer; b. at Leipsic Nov. 11, 1668; d. at Hamburg Apr. 3, 1736. He studied theology, philology, philosophy, and medicine in Leipsic, and in 1693 removed to Hamburg, where he assisted Johann Friedrich Mayer, the chief pastor of the city. Six years later he was appointed professor of ethics and rhetoric at the gymnasium, and from 1708 to 1711 was also rector of the Johanneum. He possessed a library of some 32,000 volumes, and was an extremely prolific writer. Several of his works are still unsuperseded. Among his bibliographical writings special mention may be made of the following: *Bibliotheca latina* (Hamburg, 1697; best edition by J. A. Ernesti, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1773–74); *Bibliotheca græca* (14 vols., Hamburg, 1705–28; best edition, though incomplete, by G. C. Harless, 12 vols., 1790–1809); *Bibliographia antiquaria* (1713);

Bibliotheca ecclesiastica (1718); and *Bibliotheca latina mediæ et infimæ ætatis* (5 vols., 1734–36; completed by J. D. Mansi, 6 vols., Padua, 1754). In theology his work is antiquated, although mention may still be made of his *Hydrotheologie* (1730) and *Pyrotheologie* (1732), written to show the goodness of God in creating water and fire; as well as of the *Centifolium Lutheranum* (2 vols., 1728–30), a somewhat crude bibliography of Luther and the Reformation, and of the *Salutaris lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens* (1731), with a valuable list of over 4,000 bishoprics. He likewise published a number of classical authors, but his only editions of permanent value were his *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (2 vols., 1703; enlarged, 1719) and his *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (1713; enlarged, 2 vols., 1722–23), both of which are still indispensable in a study of their subjects.

Bibliography: S. Reimarus, *De vita et scriptis J. A. Fabricii*, Hamburg, 1737; *KL*, iv. 1191–92.

FACULTIES: The term applied in canon law to powers conferred by an ecclesiastical superior upon a subordinate. The most important are the papal faculties. These are conferred on missionaries for certain cases of dispensation and absolution, especially on the heads of missionary orders; since the sixteenth century on papal nuncios in countries where, as in Germany, the Roman Catholic Church is endeavoring to recover her former footing; and on the bishops and archbishops, who are regarded as missionaries. These powers have always been limited by a regard to the special needs of the region over which they are to be exercised. Those which are conferred upon bishops in certain countries are usually good for a period of five years (hence called *facultates quinquennales*), and are normally renewed on their expiration. Besides these traditional faculties, there are certain special ones which may be regarded as an extension of them, allowing archbishops and bishops to reduce masses on a foundation, to designate certain altars as privileged, and to nominate synodal examiners. All these faculties are revocable at the will of the people. They are attached to the person of the bishop in respect of his connection with a particular diocese, and terminate by his death or removal from the particular office, but not by the death of the pope who granted them. The bishops in their turn can confer faculties upon their clergy, especially deans and vicars-general, to perform certain functions belonging to the ordinary jurisdiction of the bishop (e.g., absolution in cases reserved to the bishop); and they can also, when this right has been expressly given, subdelegate the exercise of the powers conferred on them in their *facultates quinquennales* to such officials. (P. Hinschius†.)

Bibliography: O. Mejer, *Die Propaganda, ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht*, i. 39 sqq., ii. 201 sqq., Göttingen, 1852; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, iii. 807 sqq., Berlin, 1882; N. Nilles, in *ZKT*, xv (1891), 550; A. Konings, *Commentatio in facultates apostolicas*, New York, 1893.

FACUNDUS OF HERMIANE: Bishop of Hermiane, in the North African province of Byzacena; d. after 571. He belonged to the leaders of the anti-imperial opposition in the so-called Three Chapter Controversy (q.v.) and in 548 submitted to Justinian a work in twelve books *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, in which he sought mainly to prove that the emperor's design of condemning the Antiochian theology might seriously impair the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. A second treatise, *Liber contra Mocianum scholasticum*, in opposition to the *judicatum* by which Pope Vigilius had condemned the Three Chapters, shows that he was already estranged from Rome, yet the date of composition is uncertain. A third work is the *Epistola fidei catholicæ in defensione trium capitulorum*. The three treatises are in *MPL*, lxvii. 521–878, and in A. Gallandi, *Bibliotheca*, xi. 663–821.

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: A. Harnack, *TLZ*, v (1880), 632–635; H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, pp. 50–51, Freiburg, 1880; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, pp. 562–563, ib. 1901; *DCB*, ii. 444–445.

FAGIUS, fā'gi-us **(PHAGIUS, BÜCHLEIN), PAULUS:** German theologian; b. at Rheinzabern (9 m. s.e. of Landau), Rhenish Bavaria, 1504; d. at Cambridge, England, Nov. 13, 1549. He studied at Heidelberg (1515) and at Strasburg (1522), where Capito taught him Hebrew; he became rector of the school at Isny, 1527; was a student of theology at Strasburg, 1535; returned as Evangelical pastor to Isny, 1537, and became pupil in Hebrew of Elias Levita; he succeeded Capito as pastor and theological professor in Strasburg, 1542. Violently opposed to the Interim when it was introduced (1549), he accepted Cranmer's invitation to come to England and became professor of Hebrew at Cambridge and soon died of a fever. Under Queen Mary his and Butzer's bones were exhumed and burned (Feb. 6, 1557) and their university honors were taken from them; but Queen Elizabeth ordered that the university formally restore to them their honors (July 22, 1560; cf. Foxe, *Arts and Monuments*, ed. Townsend, viii. 282–295, and *A brief Treatise concerning the Burning of Bucer and Phagius with their Restitution*, London, 1562). Fagius had a great reputation as a Hebrew scholar and his publications are upon Old Testament exegesis and Hebrew philology. In the bibliography of his writings in *La France protestante*, iii. 71 sqq., also in Strype's *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, p. 845, twenty-three works are cited, but none has any present interest.

Bibliography: An account of his life is contained in the *Historia de vita Buceri*, Strasburg, 1562. Consult: Schäffer, *Paul Fagius, der zweite evangelische Prediger am Jungen St. Peter in Strassburg*, Strasburg, 1877; *ADB*, vol. vi.; *DNB*, xviii. 120.

FAGNANI, fā"nyā"nî, **CHARLES PROSPERO:** Presbyterian; b. in New York City Oct. 29, 1854. He was graduated at the College of the City of New York in 1873, Columbia College Law School in 1875, and Union Theological Seminary in 1882. He taught in the public schools of New York 1873–1879, and was chapel minister of Grace Mission of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church 1882–85 and pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Yonkers, N. Y., 1885–86. The five years following were spent in Europe, and in 1891 he was appointed instructor in Harvard Divinity School, but was unable to accept on account of ill health. Since

1892 he has been instructor and professor of Hebrew in Union Theological Seminary. In theology he belongs to the advanced school of Presbyterianism. He has written *A Primer of Hebrew* (New York, 1903).

FAGNANI, PROSPER: Roman canonist; b. 1598; d. in Rome 1678. At twenty he was graduated as a doctor of law at Perugia, and two years later he was given the important position of secretary to the *Congregatio concilii*, which held he for fifteen years. He was afterward successively secretary to other congregations and probably professor of canon law at Rome. The commentary which, at the instance of Alexander VII., he wrote on the decretals (3 vols., Rome, 1661) is still appealed to by canonists. He was blind from his forty-fourth year.

Bibliography: *KL*, iv. 1204–1205.

FAHRNER, FRANZ IGNAZ: German Roman Catholic; b. at Richtoldsheim, Alsace, Aug. 27, 1865. He studied at the theological seminary at Strasburg 1887–92 and at the University of Munich (D.D., 1902), was chaplain at Markirch 1892–97 and vicar of the cathedral at Strasburg 1897–1900. He became professor of moral theology at the Strasburg theological seminary in 1902, and in 1903 was appointed associate professor of canon law in the University of Strasburg, where he has been professor of moral theology since 1905. He has written *Geschichte der Ehescheidung im kanonischen Recht, i. Unauflöslichkeitsprinzip und vollkommene Scheidung der Ehe* (Freiburg, 1903).

FAIRBAIRN, ANDREW MARTIN: Congregationalist; b. near Edinburgh Nov. 4, 1838. He studied in Edinburgh (B.A., 1860), at the Evangelical Union Theological Academy, Glasgow (1856–1861), and the University of Berlin (1866–67). After being minister of Evangelical Union Congregational churches at Bathgate, West Lothian (1860–1872), and St. Paul St., Aberdeen (1872–77), he was principal of Airedale College, Bradford, England, until 1886; and Mansfield College, Oxford, from 1886 till his retirement 1909. He was chairman of Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1883 and a member of the royal commission on secondary education in 1894–95, of the theological board and theological examiner in the University of Wales in 1895–1904, and of the advisory committee to the theological faculty in the University of Manchester in 1904. He was Muir Lecturer in the University of Edinburgh in 1878–82, Lyman Beecher lecturer at Yale in 1891–92, Gifford Lecturer in the University of Aberdeen in 1892–94, Haskell Lecturer of the University of Chicago in India in 1898–99, and Deems Lecturer in New York University, 1906. He has written *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History* (London, 1876); *Studies in the Life of Christ* (1881); *The City of God* (1882); *Religion in History and in Modern Life* (1884); *Christ in Modern Theology* (1893); *Christ in the Centuries* (1893); *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican* (1899); and *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (1902).

FAIRBAIRN, PATRICK: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Hallyburton (32 m. s.e. of Edinburgh), Berwickshire, Jan. 28, 1805; d. at Glasgow Aug. 6, 1874. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, was licensed to preach in 1826, and from 1830 to 1836 was located in the Orkney Islands. In 1836 he was transferred to Bridgeton, Glasgow, and in 1840 to Salton, in East Lothian. In 1843 he left the Established Church, but remained in Salton as pastor of the Free Church. In 1853 he was appointed professor of divinity in the theological college of the Free Church at Aberdeen, and in 1856 he was transferred to the Free Church college at Glasgow. He was appointed principal of the institution on Nov. 4 of the same year and held this position till his death. In 1865 he was moderator of the General Assembly, and in 1867 a member of the Scotch delegation appointed to visit Presbyterian churches in the United States. He was also one of the company for revising the Old Testament. His principal works are, *The Typology of Scripture* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1845–47; new ed., New York, 1900; a guide in the interpretation of Biblical symbolism), *Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy* (1851); *Prophecy Viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and its Proper Interpretation* (1856); *Hermeneutical Manual* (1858); and *Pastoral Theology, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author*, by J. Dodds (1875). He also edited *The Imperial Bible Dictionary* (2 vols., London, 1866) and translated several theological works from the German.

Bibliography: Besides the sketch by J. Dodds, ut sup., consult *DNB*, xviii. 122.

FAIRCHILD, JAMES HARRIS: Congregationalist; b. at Stockbridge, Mass., Nov. 25, 1817; d. at Oberlin, O., Mar. 19, 1902. He was graduated at Oberlin College in 1838, and in it was successively tutor (1838), professor of Latin and Greek (1842), of mathematics (1847), moral philosophy and systematic theology (1858), and president (1866–89). From 1889 till becoming emeritus professor (1895) he taught systematic theology in Oberlin Theological Seminary. As a teacher he was clear, philosophical, and impressive. As a theologian he succeeded Charles Grandison Finney, with whom he agreed in general, though not without differences springing from his strong individuality. He taught a "new school" Calvinism, in which the freedom of the will was emphasized to the essential modification of the system. The general cast of his system was practical and concrete rather than metaphysical; but he maintained the divinity of Christ and the trinity, the atonement (governmental theory), and the endless future punishment of the incorrigibly wicked. He maintained also the ethical doctrine to which earlier Oberlin had given prominence, the simplicity of moral action, but minimized the doctrine of perfection which had been associated with it, teaching the possibility of perfection in this life, though laying no emphasis upon it, and not asserting its probability. The foundation of moral obligation he found in the essential worth of sentient being, in immediate perception of this, and in the intuitive affirmation of obligation to promote universal well-being, by conscience. But his greatest service to

his college was as an administrator, being distinguished for his business capacity and good sense, his urbanity and patience, his entire unselfishness, his reliability, his interest in individuals, his extraordinary skill in handling men, and his power to bring things to pass, so under him the institution throve greatly. He edited the memoirs of President Finney (New York, 1876), and the latter's *Systematic Theology* (Oberlin, 1878). His other publications include *Moral Philosophy; or, The Science of Obligation* (New York, 1869); *Woman's Right to the Ballot* (1870; an affirmative statement); *Oberlin, the Colony and the College* (Oberlin, 1883); *Elements of Theology, Natural and Revealed* (1892).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. T. Swing, *Life of James Harris Fairchild*, New York, 1907.

FAITH.

I. The New Testament Conception.
The Background (§ 1).
The Teaching of Jesus (§ 2).
Paul (§ 3).
II. The Doctrine in Theology.
Before the Reformation (§ 1).
The Reformation and Modern Theology (§ 2).
Faith in Systematic Theology (§ 3).

I. The New Testament Conception: Like every New Testament conception, the idea of faith goes to the Old Testament for the key to its meaning. It was born when the political fortunes of Israel entered on their decline. The division of the kingdom and the increasing helplessness of a small state lying across the highway between Mesopotamia and Egypt conditioned its growth and character. It dealt with the future of the nation (Isa. vii. 9, viii. 17, xxvi. 1 sqq., xxviii. 16). As secular conditions grew less favorable, the mind of the representative Israelite, the prophet, stayed itself more and more on the living God, the base and spring of the nation's existence. Thus the idea of faith is inseparable from the development of prophetic monotheism. It is bound up with the unity and holiness of God and with the divine dominance over nature and history.

1. The Background.

Faith is man's part in the self-revelation of God, the method of which is vitally connected with its matter. God reveals himself through the experience and history of the chosen nation, and faith is man's assent to God's self-revelation in and through the nation's experience. By means of faith, the divine control over nature and history in the interest of a distant but authoritative moral end is vitally apprehended so as to constitute the very pith and marrow of man's moral nature. It is an act of trust, a bias and bent of the working will in man's breast, a mood in which he waits steadfastly and joyously for God's assertion of his right of way in history (Isa. xxxviii. 16; Hab. iii. 17–19).

In prophetism a supreme conception is only half blocked out. The essential quality of faith is disclosed, but its scope and method are not clearly apprehended. Judaism did much to supplement the work of later prophetism (Jeremiah and Ezekiel). The subjective side of life was developed. The nation ceased to be the exclusive unit of thought and emotion, and the individual came, in some degree, to his rights. In apocalyptics (the Book of Daniel, etc.) the divine control of history is wrought up into a splendid imaginative presentation that has vast power of appeal to the common consciousness. All this helped to enrich the conception of faith. But with the gain came a heavy loss. The apocalyptist weakened the connection between the moral ideal and the forces of history, so that the moral end becomes more or less detached from the moral process.

It was the Savior who restored the sound connection between prophecy and history. The staple of his thought was the messianic idea, the national hope of Israel. But by fulfilling the ideal of the suffering servant of the Lord he transcended Judaism. Of the two methods which his age proposed to him, the violence of the zealot and the dualistic pessimism of the apocalyptist (IV Esdras), he chose neither. He realized the kingdom of God in character, the character of man built upon the character, that is to say, the fatherhood of God. The kingdom of God is in the heart and under the eye of those who have eyes to see (Luke xvii. 21). The law of its realization is the law of service (Mark x. 45). The thought of force is expelled from the idea of God and the conception of man (Matt. xxvi. 52). The Savior carried the messianic idea out of politics (Matt. xxii. 21), but without weakening the hold of the moralizing will in God and man upon history. Saving faith, with Jesus as with the prophets, means an entire confidence in the divine control of nature and history. But by laying the foundations of eschatology in character, the Savior fulfilled the logic of prophetism and achieved spiritual and moral universalism without the loss of social vigor and organizing power (Sermon on the Mount; John xiii.–xvii.).

2. The Teaching of Jesus.

The work of Christ was summed up in the founding of a church or community devoted to his person and committed to his views and claims. This community was a new type. Its dominant mental quality was the open vision of the kingdom of God manifesting itself in ecstatic forms (the glossolalia, and I Cor. ii. 9 sqq.; see ECSTASY), not capable of translation into terms of the common good (I Cor. xiv. 20–25). But its fundamental quality was constructive prophecy (I Cor. xiv. 12), the ethical interpretation of contemporary society and history (" signs of the times ") in their bearing on the well-being and destiny of the Christian communities. The creed of these communities was the belief in the triumph of the crucified Savior (Acts ii.–vii.), expressing itself in the impassioned conviction of his resurrection and second coming. This faith was the cleansing element in life (Acts xv. 9), freeing the heart of the believer from fears regarding the inability or unwillingness of God to keep the promises made to the fathers (Acts iii. 20), and inspiring a joyous confidence in the end of the Christian's personal and social existence, which gave to the imitation of Jesus a saving and redemptive aspect (St. Stephen's dying prayer). This community is a messianic community. Dedication to the eternal, the common good, is the essence of its life (*hapanta*

koina, Acts ii. 44, iv. 32). The entire community is pledged to belief in the reality and imminence of God's sway (*parousia*). And faith in its essence is this practical Old Testament conviction, made radiant and all-controlling by the life of Christ. It is this stage of the New Testament development of faith that is represented by the Epistle of James and the First Epistle of Peter.

3. Paul.

It was the work of Paul to go to the root of the great conception first shaped by the Hebrew prophets. He did this, not by outgrowing the primitive Christian eschatology (for Christianity is fundamentally eschatologic), but by applying the work and mind of Christ to the ultimate problem, the problem of character as personality. His conversion flushed his emotions with the feeling of the divine creativeness (I Cor. xv. 8; Eph. iii. 8). His work as missionary to the Gentiles deepened this experience. It was given to him to build congregations of Christians from the ground (I Cor. i. 26 sqq.; Rom. iv. 17–18). The creative character of God manifested in Christ became the starting-point of his thinking.

When the Judaizing Christians denied his standing as an apostle and sought to stamp his work with their own views, he was driven to a fundamental analysis of the prophetic term faith, and to turn its creative and critical force against the Pharisaic conception of religious merit (*erga nomou*). How is true character or personality (*dikaiosunē*) possible? Of course the Pauline conception of righteousness differs from the conception entertained by the Hebrew prophets; four centuries of Judaism have intervened; the subjective mood is far stronger; the individual is the center of gravity. Yet the apostle continued to think along prophetic lines. He differed broadly from the monastical individual of a later age. While the salvation of the individual is his conscious aim, he thinks about the individual's blessings in terms of the common good (I Cor. ii. 9–10, xiii.). The point in question is God's ability and willingness to keep his promise of a heavenly commonwealth (Rom. iii. 4; II Cor. i. 20). To be saved by Christ is to have been brought into quickening relation with the supreme hope (Rom. viii. 24). The two great ethical terms righteousness and right, which with the separation of Church from State become more or less separated and specialized, must be brought together in thought if we are to interpret aright the words of Rom. i. 16–17.

Paul's monotheism is best contrasted with Aristotle's. To use more or less inaccurate terms, Paul's conception is an "ethical monotheism," while Aristotle's is metaphysical. That is to say, Aristotle's final statement is in terms of pure reason, while Paul's is in terms of common and social well-being. It is in the unity between Jew and Gentile that for him the mystery of things centers (*mystērion*, Rom. xi. 25 sqq.; Eph. ii. 11–iii. 19). The religious and social unity of the Mediterranean world was his supreme object. As with Isaiah, so, on a different level, with Paul, the creative and vitalizing unity of God invading history through Christ is the all-controlling thought. God can efficiently manifest himself only in terms of human unity (Rom. iii. 27 sqq.; I Cor. i.–iv.; Phil. i. 27–ii. 11). A saving faith is, necessarily, a creatively social faith (the two editions of the trilogy: I Thess. i. 3, and I Cor. xiii. 13). Faith in Christ pledges the redeemed man to the realization of the kingdom of God (Gal. v. 6).

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Hellenistic or metaphysical element enters, coming from Alexandrine Judaism and its reflective view of revelation. But the Hellenic element is controlled and directed by the prophetic element. Faith is defined (xi. 1) as that state of the heart and that bias of will in men which gives substance to things hoped for and secures a solid conviction regarding the reality of things unseen. Here as elsewhere, faith is inseparable from the kingdom of God. The things hoped for are the messianic blessings promised by God through the prophets. Faith in Christ gives them a body, imparts to the conscience moral certitude touching the end and issues of history. Owing to the blending of the philosophical and prophetic elements in this definition the Church catholic adopted it as its working conception.

The different shades of meaning in New Testament writers serve to bring out more clearly the decisive agreement. Faith is the saving assent of the heart to Christ's proclamation of the supreme moral order described as the kingdom of God. The creedal conception of faith grows out of this conception, under the historical conditions of a later period in the Church. But, owing to those conditions, the creedal conception is not wholly true to the New Testament emphasis on the kingdom of God. Faith, in the New Testament sense, is man's perception of the spiritual and moral order of experience and life offered to man by God in Christ. But it is more than a perception. It is the supreme form of will-power in man. By faith he perceives, and in faith he wills and, under God, ordains the moral equality and the moral end of human history. Through the believer's self-surrender to the divine plan for the nation and the race, God gives him a righteousness that has vitalizing and unifying power among the complications of life, and at the same time, gives to society the promise of justice and right. Without this organizing power, faith shrivels to the individual's confidence in his personal salvation.

HENRY S. NASH.

II. The Doctrine in Theology: Faith, in the language of religion, is that personal attitude by which divine revelation is subjectively appropriated. With Paul it was the all-sufficient ground of righteousness and justification (Rom. iv. 22 sqq.)—

1. Before the Reformation.

a view which was soon obscured in the Christian Church. With the Apostolic Fathers the connection of faith with the attitude of love was more a postulate than an inherent necessity (I Clement x. 7, xii. 1; Shepherd of Hermas, Sim. VIII. ix. 1). Moralistic and intellectualistic thoughts of foreign origin penetrated Christianity and as early as Clement of Alexandria faith was supplanted by love as condition of salvation and

by gnosis as the knowledge of revelation, and became nothing more than a rudimentary step in the development of the Christian. For Augustine, too, faith means only the "beginning of religion." To believe means *cum assensione cogitare* (*De prædestinatione sanctorum*, v.) and assent is obedience to the law of a formal authority which primarily is Scripture, but then also the Church. Faith is decisive for the reception of salvation only in so far as it is active through love. The consummating effect of grace is therefore the inspiration of love (*inspiratio dilectionis*). Similar thoughts were advanced by Anselm of Canterbury, and Peter Lombard first coined the expressions *fides informis* (=mere faith) and *fides formata* (=faith connected with love). Thomas Aquinas defines faith on the basis of Augustine's formula (*cum assensione cogitare*) as an act of the intellect which is impelled to assent by the will. Although in the last instance related to the first cause or deity, faith has reference principally to the Church; it is a faith of authority.

2. The Reformation and Modern Theology.

The Reformation gave back to faith its immediate relation to the revelation of salvation and understood it again in the Pauline sense as the personal apprehension of divine grace in Christ. Luther describes faith as a living trust of the heart. The *assensus*, according to him, is an assenting impulse of the will which originates in the impression of the truth of the divine word upon the conscience and heart. God's revelation, which awakens faith, sets all spiritual powers of man into motion, and the assent to his Word and knowledge of his grace are born only with the trust in salvation. Love can not be separated from faith. Melanchthon taught the same views, but in the later form of his *Loci* distinguished between *notitia*, *assensus*, *fiducia*, and prepared the way for the mechanical view of the later orthodox school which regarded *notitia* and *assensus* as preliminary steps of *fiducia*. Johann Gerhard advanced this view. According to it, a rational knowledge of divine revelation is necessary before we can inwardly assent to it. David Hollaz drew the consistent conclusion that such an abstract conviction of the truth of Scripture can be only a faith of authority.

In modern theology Schleiermacher's conception of religion as an original inner experience, distinguished from knowledge and action, has exercised a decisive influence upon the treatment of the conception of faith, by the establishment of a psychological scheme; but owing to his insufficient appreciation of historical revelation, his doctrine of faith bears the traits of a general religion rather than of the Christian faith of salvation. R. Rothe prepared the way for a more definite grasp of Christian faith by emphasizing more strongly the historical and yet at the same time supranatural element of revelation. A. Ritschl defined faith as trust (*fiducia*) in the revelation of God in Christ and demanded rightly that the faith of providence should be understood as the realization of the Christian faith of atonement, but his connection of justification with the existence of the community of believers led him to the conclusion that the reception of the forgiveness of sins forms rather the presupposition than the content of individual faith. In general it may be said that there exists in modern Protestant theology an agreement on the following points: (1) Faith does not originate from logical processes, but from an immediate inner experience. (2) It is not a human achievement and not the acknowledgment of a human authority, but an effect of God through his revelation. (3) The *assensus* in the sense of conviction of faith and knowledge of faith can not be separated from *fiducia*. (4) Trust in salvation presupposes an awakened knowledge of sin and the desire for salvation. (5) The new moral life of the Christian has as its basis the forgiveness of sins, which has been received in faith.

3. Faith in Systematic Theology.

The conception of faith is usually treated in systematic theology both in a general way as the principle of Christian knowledge, and more specifically, in the doctrine of salvation, as the medium of the appropriation of salvation. In the former case it refers to revelation in general and is treated in its relation to knowledge; in the latter case it refers to the salutary gift of the forgiveness of sins and is treated in its relation to repentance and works. Since Christian revelation culminates in redemption, only the faith of salvation is the truly Christian faith of revelation. In redemption God reveals himself as holy love which saves the sinner; the faith of the Christian bears therefore the character of a grateful trust in God who effects his salvation in Christ. This trust has its basis and support in the revelation of salvation which is appropriated by the believer. Faith may therefore be traced back to two primary elements, to an activity of God, in which he realizes his holy love through redemption, and to an experience of man in which he recognizes and seizes the revelation of salvation as his own possession. Because trust of salvation is based upon historical revelation, it includes a certain representation of God and his activity which develops into knowledge of faith; but because this revelation can be understood only by him who seizes it in trust, knowledge of faith can not exist without experience of faith. Objections might be raised against the statement that faith rests upon an inner experience because in this way its objective basis in God's revelation might be obscured; but the origin of faith must be traced back to the effect of God and not to man's own decision. The fundamental act of God which awakens Christian faith is to be found in the sending forth of Christ and in his work of redemption. The deciding motive of faith is Christ as he is represented in the testimony of his first disciples. Although faith is a spontaneous and original experience which can not be derived from anything else, a definite psychic disposition may be spoken of without which faith of salvation does not originate; namely, knowledge of sin and its misery. Christ as the redeemer can be seized with real trust only by him who desires to become free from sin. Therefore it is pertinent that the reformatory doctrine of salvation places repentance before faith.

Nevertheless, the repentance which prepares the way for faith is neither a perfect knowledge of sin nor a complete deliverance from it. It is only a longing for justification. It is therefore true that repentance, without which faith of salvation does not come into existence, becomes an accomplished fact only with that faith. The division of the uniform function of faith into the three acts of *notitia, assensus*, and *fiducia* is misleading, if it is to be understood as rational explanation of the origin of faith. *Notitia* and *assensus* have to do with religious faith only if they are included in *fiducia*. It is self-evident, of course, that trust of salvation can not originate without hearing of the message of salvation, but the *assensus* as a certain conviction of the power of redemption of Christ and of the reality of a transcendent God can take place only in and with *fiducia*. All certainty and knowledge of God and divine things has its origin in *fiducia*. To this certainty which faith gives, belongs before everything that trusting certainty of one's personal salvation which the Reformation opposed to the uncertainty of salvation as taught by the medieval Church and the Council of Trent. It is upheld by the testimony of the Spirit; i.e., by the inwardly experienced union with Christ and God. But in this communion with God there is at the same time the source of a new moral activity. There is no appropriation of the divine grace of salvation which does not include the appropriation of the holy will of God; but even as the principle of Christian morality, faith does not lose its receptive character. The will to do good does not originate from a power which faith possesses in itself, but from the power which it continually receives from its union with Christ. On the same basis there arises for the Christian finally the knowledge of faith which is distinguished from other knowledge in so far as it presupposes the individually conditioned experience of salvation and in so far as it is the perception of existing reality in the light of the transcendent knowledge of God, a perception *sub specie æternitatis*. As knowledge of faith has been acquired at the highest summit attainable to man, it must necessarily decide before everything his view of the world, although it is true that its connection with the knowledge of the world presents special difficulties on account of its different origin and point of view; nevertheless, it is the indispensable task of Christian theology to find the right method for a harmony. (O. KIRN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY. A large literature in English is indicated in J. F. Hurst, *Literature of Theology*, pp. 706–707, New York, 1896. On the New Testament idea consult: A. Schlatter, *Der Glaube im N. T.*, Stuttgart, 1896; F. C. Baur, *Paulus*, ii., part i., chap. 4, Stuttgart, 1845, Eng. transl., *Paul the Apostle*, London, 1875 (not to be neglected); O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinismus*, part i., chap. iv., Leipsic, 1873, Eng. transl., *Paulinism*, London, 1877; and the works on N. T. theology by Weiss, Beyschlag, and Gould mentioned in or under BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

For faith as a theological concept consult: T. C. Upham, *The Life of Faith*, Boston, 1845; J. Müller, *Dogmatische Abhandlungen*, Bremen, 1870; J. H. Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, London, 1870; H. Wace, *The Foundations of Faith*, ib. 1880; J. Kaftan, *Glaube und Dogma*, Bielefeld, 1889, idem, *Truth of the Christian Religion*, vol. ii., London, 1893; A. Ritschl, *Fides implicita*, Bonn, 1890; A. Harnack, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, i (1891), 82 sqq.; F. E. König, *Der Glaubensakt der Christen*, Leipsic, 1891; P. Strutt, *The Nature of Faith*, London, 1891; J. Köstlin, *Die Begründung unserer sittlich-religiösen Ueberzeugung*, Berlin, 1893; idem, *Der Glaube und seine Bedeutung für Erkenntniss, Leben und Kirche*, ib. 1895; J. Haussleiter, *Greifswalder Studien*, pp. 159 sqq., Greifswald, 1895; K. Thieme, *Die sittliche Triebkraft des Glaubens*, Leipsic, 1895; G. Vorbrodt, *Psychologie des Glaubens*, Göttingen, 1895; M. Kähler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Jesus*, Leipsic, 1896; F. Sieffert, *Die neuesten theologischen Forschungen über Busse und Glaube*, Berlin, 1896; W. James, *The Will to Believe*, New York, 1897; M. Reischle, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, vi (1897), iii.: idem, *Christliche Glaubenslehre*, Halle, 1902; W Bright, *The Law of Faith*, London, 1899; G. A. Gordon, *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith*, Boston, 1903; A. C. A. Hall, *Relations of Faith and Life*, London, 1905; W. Schmidt, *Moderne Theologie des alten Glaubens*, Gütersloh, 1906; and the literature under DOGMA, DOGMATICS.

FAITH, RULE OF. See REGULA FIDEI.

FAKIR. See HINDUISM, I, § 1.

FALASHAS. See ABYSSINIA AND THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH, §§ 1, 7.

FALCONER, ROBERT ALEXANDER: Presbyterian; b. at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Feb. 10, 1867. He studied in London (B.A., 1888), Edinburgh (M.A., 1889; B.D., 1892), Berlin, Leipsic, and Marburg, and since 1892 has been connected with the Presbyterian College, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as lecturer in New Testament exegesis (1892–95), professor of the same subject (1895–1904) and principal (since 1904). He has written *The Truth of the Apostolic Gospel* (New York, 1904).

FALCONIO, DIOMEDE: Roman Catholic archbishop and apostolic delegate; b. at Pescocostanzo (73 m. n. of Naples), Italy, Sept. 20, 1842. He entered the Franciscan Order in 1860, and five years later was sent to the United States as missionary. In 1866 he was ordained priest, and was professor of philosophy and vice-president of St. Bonaventure's College, Alleghany, Pa. (1866), professor of theology and secretary of the Franciscan Province of the Immaculate Conception (1867), and president of the College and Seminary of St. Bonaventure (1868–71). He was secretary and administrator of the cathedral at Harbor Grace, N. F., 1871–82, and after a year in the United States returned to Italy and was elected provincial of the Franciscans in the Abruzzi. He was later reelected, and in 1888 was commissary and visitor-general for the province of Puglia, becoming in 1889 synodal examiner for the diocese of Aquila and commissary and visitor-general for the Franciscan province of Puglia. He was procurator-general of his order and visitor-general in various Franciscan provinces from 1889 to 1892, when he was consecrated titular bishop of Lacedonia, being elevated, three years later, to be archbishop of Acerenza and Matera in Basilicata. He was Apostolic Delegate to Canada 1899–1902, and since 1902 has been apostolic delegate to the United States.

FALK, fölk, JOHANNES DANIEL: German philanthropist; b. at Danzig Oct. 28, 1768; d. at Weimar Feb. 14, 1826. He was the son of a wigmaker who belonged to the Reformed Church, and

received but a limited education, until, by the intervention of friends and relatives, he was allowed to study music, and to take part in the musical entertainments in the Catholic Church. In his home he had the opportunity of learning French, which he gradually supplemented by a knowledge of English. In 1787 he was awarded a stipend which enabled him to pursue the study of theology at the University of Halle, but gradually he forsook theology for philology and literature. Filled with plans for a literary career, he settled in Weimar, and was cordially received by Wieland, Goethe, and Herder. Falk's trend was essentially satiric, and he accordingly began to criticize the weaknesses and inconsistencies manifested by the social and poetical conditions of his time. The events which were then agitating Germany finally caused Falk to become more practical in his tendencies, and in 1806 he began the publication of a periodical instead of the belletristic *Taschenbücher*. The main title of this journal *Elysium und Tartarus*, was still reminiscent of his former tendency, but its subtitle, *Zeitung für Poesie, Kunst und Zeitgeschichte*, revealed a new interest in life. On account of its freedom of expression, however, the periodical was suppressed before the battle of Jena (Oct. 14, 1806).

This conflict marked a turning-point in Falk's career. The French commission chose him as a mediator between itself and the populace, and in this position he was enabled to prevent many an injustice and to alleviate much suffering. In recognition of his services the grand duke of Weimar created him a *Legationsrat*, while the people honored him with the title of "the benevolent councilor." The war claimed still other services from him. Many orphaned children sought refuge with him, and he took them into his home in the place of his own children, who had fallen victims in the struggle. Together with Horn of Weimar he founded Die Gesellschaft der Freunde in der Not (The Society of Friends in Need), and remained its moving spirit. This society assumed the task of distributing the orphaned children in the homes of citizens, although Falk made it a rule to keep some of them in his house until he could form an idea of their capabilities, while a teacher's training was given those who showed an aptitude for learning.

Falk shared with Francke the pedagogic tendency to make confidence in God the center and aim of all activity; not in the punctilious spirit of Pietism, but with freedom and joy. His lofty ideals savor of Pestalozzi in his insistence on the close companionship of teacher and pupil. The beautiful songs, such as *O du fröhliche* and *Was kann schöner sein*, which he wrote among and for the children, form a fitting close to his literary career. Although devoid of essentially religious training, and lacking denominational character, Falk's activity, a precursor of Reinthaler's Martinstift at Erfurt and Wichern's Rauhes Haus at Horn, may be said to have been a forerunner not only of educational societies, but also of home missions. This view was voiced by himself when he said, "The chief aim pursued by our society for eleven years seems a form of missionary work, a saving of souls, a conversion of heathen; not in Asia or Africa, but in our own midst, in Saxony and in Prussia"; and he himself characterizes the great turning-point in his life in the following words: "I was one of a thousand scamps in German literature, who thought that they served the world if they sat at their desks, yet by the grace of God I was not, like the rest, made into writing paper, but was used as lint, and placed in the open wounds of the age. So they tear me and pluck me the whole day long, for the wound is deep, and they use me to stanch it as long as a shred is left of me."

(THEODOR SCHÄFER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Rosalie Falk, *Erinnerungsblätter*, Weimar, 1868; W. Heinzelmann, *J. Falk und die Gesellschaft der Freunde in der Noth*, Brandenburg, 1879; *Das Leben des Johannes Falk*, Hamburg, 1892; W Baur, *Geschichts- und Lebensbilder aus der Erneuerung des religiösen Lebens*, p. 223, ib. 1893; P. Wurster, *Die Lehre von der Inneren Mission*, p. 32, Berlin, 1895; *ADB*, vi. 549.

FALKENBERG, JOHANNES: Dominican, professor of theology at Cracow; d. at Liegnitz (40 m. w.n.w. of Breslau), Silesia, after 1438. In the light of his writings thus far published and what has been published about him, he is noteworthy only on account of the accusation brought against him by the Polish delegation to the Council of Constance. Commissioned by the Teutonic Order, with which Poland was then waging a hot contest for its existence, he had written an impassioned tract against the Polish king, to the effect that as the king had supported infidels in warfare against believers, he was himself to be treated as an unbeliever. After Martin V had occupied the "orphaned" see of St. Peter, the Polish envoys succeeded by brutal proceedings, in bringing Falkenberg to trial. By the condemnation of Falkenberg, which was pronounced secretly as early as May 14, 1418, the pope secured, in Jan., 1424, the Polish support against a new council. Falkenberg was then set free, and after still plying his envenomed pen against the Teutonic Order, which had not rewarded him to his satisfaction, he is supposed to have died on the way home.

B. BESS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are certain of his tracts in *Gersonii Opera*, ed. Du Pin, v. 1020–29, Antwerp, 1706; *Monumenta . . res gestas Poloniæ illustrantia*, viii (1883), no. 581, xii (1891), 113, 170–174. Consult B. Bess, in *ZKG*, xvi (1892), part 3.

FALK LAWS. See ULTRAMONTANISM.

FALL OF MAN. See SIN.

FALLOWS, SAMUEL: Reformed Episcopal bishop; b. at Pendleton (a suburb of Manchester), Lancashire, England, Dec. 13, 1835. He emigrated to the United States at the age of thirteen and was graduated at the University of Wisconsin in 1859. He was vice-president of Galesville University, Galesville, Wis., in 1859–61 and a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1859 to 1875. He served in the Union army during the Civil War, and was promoted colonel and brevet brigadier-general. After the cessation of hostilities he was pastor of a Methodist church in Milwaukee. He was a regent of the University of Wisconsin 1866–1874 and state superintendent of public instruction

for Wisconsin 1870–74. In 1874–75 he was president of Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill., but in 1875 withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Reformed Episcopal denomination. Since 1875 he has been rector of St. Paul's Reformed Episcopal Church, Chicago, and has been a bishop of the Church since 1876. He has been elected presiding bishop seven times. In 1876 he founded the Reformed Episcopal *Appeal*, which he edited for four years. Among his writings mention may be made of *Bright and Happy Homes* (Chicago, 1877); *The Home Beyond* (1879); *Past Noon* (Cincinnati, O., 1886); *The Bible Looking Glass* (Naperville, Ill., 1898); *Popular and Critical Biblical Dictionary* (Chicago, 1901); and *Christian Philosophy* (1905.)

FAMILIAR SPIRIT. See DIVINATION, § 1.

FAMILIARES: A term applied to domestic servants or craftsmen employed in the service of a monastery, who, without being either monks or lay brothers, were considered as belonging in a sense to the order, and were thus required to join in certain religious exercises.

FAMILIARITAS (COMMENSALITIUM): In canon law, a term describing one of the grounds on which a bishop may ordain a man who does not strictly belong to his diocese. It is not required that the candidate shall have literally lived in the bishop's house and sat at his table, but he must have received his support from the bishop's personal funds, and have been for three years in such close communication with the bishop that the latter shall have had full opportunity to acquaint himself with his character. A benefice must also be provided for him by the bishop within a month after his ordination.

FAMILISTS (Family of Love; Huis der Liefde; Familia caritatis): A short-lived religious community, founded in Emden, East Friesland, about 1540 by Hendrik Niclaes, or Niclas, and exercising a certain amount of influence in the religious confusion of the later English Revolution, as well as in the Philadelphian Society of Jane Lead (q.v.).

The Founder.

Born of Roman Catholic parentage on Jan. 9 or 10, 1502 or 1501, possibly at Münster, Niclaes spent the first twenty-nine years of his life in his native city as a merchant. He was originally a devoted follower of the ancient faith, and even in his career as the leader of a sect he felt still formally connected with Roman Catholicism. However, he entered into spiritual communion with many who were inclined toward the Reformation, and in 1528 he was imprisoned for a short time, but was released for lack of evidence. Some time before 1531 he settled in Amsterdam, remaining there more than nine years. The only details known concerning this residence are that within a year he was again imprisoned, and that after his speedy release he lived in seclusion, devoting himself to a life of Pietism. It was not until his thirty-ninth year that Niclaes became a figure of importance, and claimed that revelations had assured him that God had poured upon him the "spirit of the true love of Jesus Christ," and had chosen him from his youth to be the prophet to prepare the way for the approaching end of time. In this period he began to commit his revelations to writing, and for twenty years (1540 – 60), Emden was the center both of his mercantile activity and his religious propaganda, while he journeyed throughout Holland and Flanders, and also visited Paris and London. To this period belong the majority of his writings, of which the most important were *Den Spegel der Gherechticheit, dorch den Geist der Lieffden unde den vergodeden Mensch H. N uth de hemmelische Warheit betüget*, and *Evangelium offte eine frölicke Bodeschop des Rycke godes unde Christi* (Eng. transl., *An Introduction to the Understanding of the Glasse of Righteousness*, by C. Vittell, 1575 [?]). Most of these works were printed secretly, but, as is now certain, partly by the press of the famous Antwerp printer Plantin, who had become a convert to Niclaes' views about 1550, despite the fact that later he was the "prototypographus" of the king of Spain and printer to the Holy See. Niclaes himself continued to be ostensibly a strict Roman Catholic, his works being disseminated by his closest disciples, while he himself established his *Familia caritatis* at Emden.

This was essentially a community of mystic indifferentism, only loosely connected with historic Christianity. While the teachings of the Bible and the Church were not denied, they were practically ignored, being regarded either as a mere preparation for the age of love, or being reduced to allegories. The basis of the system is a mystic pantheism, which explains how Niclaes could believe that God and Christ had become incarnate in himself, although others also might thus partake of God. On the other hand, the self-consciousness of the founder, who did not hesitate to term himself an incarnation of God or Christ, often defeated the logical consequences of pantheism; and the organization of the sect, with its twenty-four elders, archbishops, four classes of priests, and "supreme bishop," was entirely monarchical. A centralized administration was necessitated, moreover, by the complicated system of priests professing poverty, a community giving tithes, and an involved law of inheritance. There is no reason to suppose, however, that Niclaes was a conscious hypocrite, although his mysticism of love had an antinomian tendency, and both the organization of the sect and many practises of the community were not free from peril. The propaganda of Niclaes did not escape the notice of the authorities of Emden. Niclaes himself escaped in 1560, before proceedings could be taken against him, and lived the life of a refugee for several years, residing successively at Kampen, Utrecht, probably again in England, and, after 1570 in Cologne. He seems to have died in 1580, the year in which appeared his *Terra Pacis. Wäre Getügenisse van idt geistelick Landschop des Fredes* (Eng. transl., *Terra Pacis. A True Testification of the Spirituall Lande of Promyse*, 1575 [?]). His success on the Continent had been comparatively slight. At the time of his death he had disciples in Amsterdam, Antwerp, Dort, Kampen,

Doctrines of the Familists.

Rotterdam, Emden, Cologne, and Paris, but in all these places the community seems to have survived only a short time, the last certain mention of them dating from 1604.

The Familists in England.

In England the influence of the Familists was deeper and more lasting. The entering wedge seems to have been a Dutch congregation in London, with whom Niclaes came in contact, especially as this community included adherents of David Joris (q.v.) and similar fanatics. Christopher Vitel, a native of Delft, the city of Joris, was, moreover, long the head of the English Familists, but the movement soon spread to genuinely English soil, and the most of the writings of Niclaes were translated into English. In 1574 the English government proceeded against the Familists, whereupon they addressed to Parliament *An Apology for the Service of Love and the People that Own it*, and in the following year issued *A Brief Rehearsal of the Belief of the Goodwilling in England, which are named the Family of Love*. They were answered by John Rogers and John Knewstub, and on Oct. 3, 1580, Elizabeth issued a proclamation against them which condemned their books and directed that the sectaries themselves be imprisoned. A week later a formula of abjuration was promulgated, and laws against the Familists soon followed. The sect did not disappear, however, and James I. was addressed by them in petitions soon after his accession, but in vain. The new monarch was extremely antagonistic to them, and had declared as early as the preface to his *Basilicon doron* in 1599, that they were responsible for the rise of Puritanism. After the fall of the Stuarts, they were opposed by John Etherington, but in the Republican period many of the works of Niclaes were reprinted, while it has been suggested that Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* owes its inspiration to Familist writings. They were also closely connected with the Ranters of the Commonwealth. After the Restoration the Familists vanished, and by the beginning of the eighteenth century but one aged member of the sect was known to be alive.

The Successor of Niclaes.

Niclaes' faithless disciple Hendrik Jansen of Barreveldt, writing under the pseudonym of Hiel, long survived his teacher. Of his life little is known, although in his later years he himself says that he led the life of a wanderer. He was closely associated with Plantin and his family, who printed the greater part of his writings, his chief work being *Het Boeck der Gheuygenissen van den verborgen Ackerschat*, published by Plantin at Antwerp in Flemish and French about 1580. Hiel discarded the hierarchic and ceremonial traditions of his master, and declared all external worship a matter of indifference, thus rendering it possible for the famous Antwerp printer to remain formally in the Roman Catholic Church, and to belong to the Spanish Catholic party despite his sympathy with the Familists. (F Loofs.)

Bibliography: The fundamental work for a study of Niclaes and his sect is F. Nippold, *Heinrich Niclaes und das Haus der Liebe*, in *ZHT*, xxxii (1862), 323–402, 473–563, which uses original and newly discovered sources, all of which and others are noted by J. H. Hessels, *Notes and Queries*, Oct.–Nov., 1869. The article in *DNB*, xl 427–431 is exceedingly valuable. Consult further: G. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*, ii. 123 sqq., 4 vols., Frankfort, 1700–15; C. A. Tiele, *Christophe Plantin et le sectaire mystique Henrik Niclaes*, in *Le Bibliophile Belge*, iii (1868), 121–138 (uses original sources partly the same as Nippold's, ut sup.); M. Rooses, *Christophe Plantin*, pp. 441 sqq., Antwerp, 1882 (sets forth Plantin's relation to Niclaes and the sect); A. J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, xiii. 177–185, Haarlem, 1868; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies*, , pp. 158–160, Philadelphia, 1874 (useful for references to books treating of the sect in England).

FAMILY AND MARRIAGE RELATIONS, HEBREW

Patriarchal Constitution of the Family (§ 1).
Marriage Effected by Purchase (§ 2).
The Wife's Property Rights (§ 3).
Polygamy the Rule (§ 4).
Tendency toward Monogamy (§ 5).
Ethical and Social Limitations and Preferences (§ 6).
Divorce (§ 7).
Legal Status of Woman (§ 8).
Social Position of Woman (§ 9).
Wedding Customs (§ 10).
Legal Position of the Widow (§ 11).
The Levirate (§ 12).
Desire for Children (§ 13).
Customs at Birth (§ 14).
Legal Status and Training of Children (§ 15).
Position of the First-born (§ 16).

In historical times the Israelite family was patriarchal, i.e., kinship, tribal affinity, and inheritance were determined by descent from the father; though there was a time when matriarchy existed among the Semites, these relations then being determined by the mother. And it must be admitted that among the Hebrews traces are found of former matriarchal conditions, e.g., the position occupied by such women as Leah, Rachel, Bilhah, Zilpah, Keturah, and Hagar. Expressions found in Gen. xlii. 38, xliii. 29, xliv. 20 (cf. Judges ix. 2) show how long the feeling persisted that relationship was determined by the mother. Descent from the same mother but not from the father formed a barrier to marriage. This is shown by marriage with half-sister, stepmother, and daughter-in-law, a practise which continued till the exile (Ezek. xxii. 10–11). Characteristics of the matriarchy were: derivation of name from the mother (Gen. xxx. 3), inheritance through her (Gen. xxi. 10), marriage of the girl through the brother's initiative (not the father's; Gen. xxiv.; only in verse 50 is Bethuel's name added), and marriage of the man into the family of the wife (Gen. xxiv. 5; Judges xiv., xv. 2).

1. Patriarchal Constitution of the Family.

Marriage was effected by purchase. The legal relation was founded upon an engagement accomplished by the payment of purchase-money. The engaged girl became the property of the man, and in case of rape or infidelity was treated as a married woman. Written marriage-contracts, which were customary among the ancient Babylonians (*Code of Hammurabi*, § 128), are not mentioned until a late period (Tobit vii. 14). The father received the purchase-money; but in course of time this custom changed and a part of the

2. Marriage Effected by Purchase.

money went to the bride. On an average the price was about fifty shekels (Deut. xxii. 29; cf. Ex. xxii. 16–17; *Code of Hammurabi*, § 139). This obligation could also be met in other ways: Jacob served as a hired hand (Gen. xxix. 15 sqq.), others accomplished feats of war (Josh. xv. 16; I Sam. xvii. 25, xviii. 20 sqq.). While not explicitly stated in the Old Testament, it is implied that the unjustifiable withdrawal of the bridegroom caused him to lose the purchase-price. If the father-in-law withdrew, he had to repay the money twofold (*Code of Hammurabi*, §§ 159, 160).

All that the wife brought with her were the presents, if any, received from the groom (Gen. xxiv. 53, xxxiv. 12; cf. *Code of Hammurabi*, § 159), and those from her family (Josh. xv. 16 sqq.), including particularly slaves for her personal service (Gen. xvi. 2, xxiv. 59, xxix. 24 sqq.). There is no mention of a dowry, properly speaking, until after the exile (Tobit viii. 21; Ecclus. xxv. 22; I Kings ix. 16 proves only the Egyptian custom). Daughters could not inherit paternal property; but whatever they brought into matrimony with them remained theirs. The husband had no authority over the personal slaves of the wife (Gen. xvi. 6, xxx. 3 sqq.). In the absence of any express statement to the contrary, it must be assumed that in case of separation or death of the husband, the wife received back her original property (cf. *Code of Hammurabi*, §§ 137, 138, 171, 172).

3. The Wife's Property Rights.

The consent of the girl was not necessary to the engagement, though it is probable that she was usually consulted (Gen. xxiv. 58). The negotiations were conducted by the girl's father or guardian (Gen. xxiv. 50, xxix. 23, xxxiv. 12); for the unmarried daughter belonged to her father, who had the right to sell her (Ex. xxi. 7). The seduction of a girl was a trespass against the father, who could demand of the offender the usual price of a wife without being required to give the girl in marriage to the seducer (Ex. xxii. 16–17).

In contrast to the custom in ancient Babylon, polygamy was the rule in Israel. In Babylon (*Code of Hammurabi*) a man could marry only one principal wife, but he was allowed to keep another woman in addition, unless his wife gave him one of her slaves as a concubine. In Israel the only limit to the number of wives was ability to support them. Wealthy men made extensive use of their rights (cf. II Sam. v 13; I Kings xi. 1 sqq.); still the law of the kingdom, referring covertly to Solomon, forbade the King to take many wives (Deut. xvii. 17). The Talmudists allow to the king not more than eighteen wives at one time, to a man of the people not more than four. Presumably the commoner in Israel, like the modern peasant in Palestine, was content with one or two wives. If the first wife remained barren, the husband was entitled to either another wife or a concubine, in which case the wife might voluntarily give him her handmaid (Gen. xvi. 1 sqq., xxx. 3 sqq.; cf. *Code of Hammurabi*, § 144).

4. Polygamy the Rule.

But even this limited polygamy caused much inconvenience, particularly in the status of the childless wife (Gen. xvi. 4 sqq.; cf. xxx.; I Sam. i. 1 sqq.). The later law took the part of the discarded wife (Deut. xxi. 15 sqq.); and the former custom of marrying two sisters at the same time was prohibited (Lev. xviii. 18). The development was toward monogamy; and Gen. ii. 18 sqq., as well as passages in the Prophets, where the relation of God to his people is characterized as one of marriage, shows that monogamy was regarded as the normal state. The praise of the virtuous wife in the Proverbs and elsewhere proves that the later period saw in monogamy the ideal marriage (Ps. cxxviii.; Prov. xii. 4, xviii. 22, xix. 14, xxxi. 10 sqq.; Ecclus. xxv. 1 sqq., etc.).

5. Tendency toward Monogamy.

Impediments to marriage were unknown to ancient custom, except that marriage between father and daughter or mother and son was always looked upon as an abomination. Theoretically the young man might choose a wife wherever he pleased; practically, he was limited. Since it was a question of admitting a woman into the family, marriage became a family affair. The father chose the bride for his son (Gen. xxiv. 2 sqq., xxviii. 1 sqq., xxxviii. 6), and it was unseemly for the son to marry against the will of his parents (Gen. xxvi. 34–35, xxvii. 46). Yet the preferences of the young people were taken into account; and, since there were no particular restraints on the social intercourse of the sexes, there was ample opportunity for the development of such attachments (Gen. xxiv. 58; Ex. ii. 16; I Sam. ix. 11, etc.). Yet by custom, marriages outside of the tribe were interdicted, while marriages with relations were preferred (Gen. xxix. 19; Num. xxvi. 59, and often in patriarchal history). Particularly the cousin on the father's side was chosen as a girl's wooer (cf. the cases of Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob and Rachel), a custom that still exists. To be sure, settlement in Canaan brought changes, and marriages with Canaanites and other foreigners were not infrequent (Judges iii. 6; II Sam. iii. 3; I Kings xi. 1, etc.). In the regal period friendship for the Canaanites turned to hatred, and marriages with heathen peoples, except the Egyptians and the Edomites, were prohibited (Deut. vii. 1 sqq., xxiii. 4 sqq.; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 16). Still, the law was not carried out, and no lasting change was effected till the time of Ezra (Ezra ix. and x.). The law sought also to limit marriages with relations and forbade marriage with stepmother, with sister or half-sister, and with mother-in-law (Deut. xxvii. 20, 22). But even this did not break the popular custom (Ezek. xxii. 10–11). Finally, the priest-code forbade marriage with mother or stepmother, niece or aunt, with the wife of an uncle on the faher's side, with mother-in-law or daughter-in-law, or with the wife of a brother (Lev. xviii. 6 sqq.; cf. xx. 11 sqq.). The prohibition of marriage with a daughter is probably omitted through error in the text. Thus, union between uncle and niece, between nephew and widow of the mother's brother, and between the children of brothers and

6. Ethical and Social Limitations and Preferences.

sisters was permitted. On the whole, these regulations correspond to pre-Islamitic Arabian custom, which Mohammed enacted into law.

The husband could divorce his wife at will, since she was his property (so in *Code of Hammurabi*); but he forfeited the purchase-price and the wife's property. In the *Code of Hammurabi*, if the wife is not to blame, the husband must compensate her. This tended to limit divorce. On the other hand, the wife and her family suffered no injustice thereby; at least no moral blemish attached to

7. Divorce. the wife. The law in Deuteronomy evidently attempts to limit divorce. It demands a written bill of divorce (xxiv. 1 sqq.), deprives the husband of the right to divorce a wife at all in two cases (xxii. 19, 28), and decrees that a divorced woman who has married again can not return to her first husband when she is free a second time (xxiv. 1 sqq.), in contrast to the earlier custom, which corresponded to the Arab usage (Hosea iii. 3; cf. II Sam. iii. 14). Finally, this law requires that there must be cause for divorce. Hillel's school interpreted this to mean that any cause was sufficient for a divorce, particularly any unseemly behavior. The more austere school of Shammai found that immoral conduct was meant. Unfortunately the true meaning of the law can not be learned from the Old Testament, and by way of comparison one may well consult the *Code of Hammurabi* (§§ 141–143), where an unwifely attitude, extravagance, etc. are made grounds for divorce (cf. Ecclus. xxv. 18 sqq., xlii. 9). In Deuteronomy the tendency is toward a higher position for the wife; and Malachi (ii. 13–14) condemns divorces unconditionally. Unlike the women of ancient Babylon (*Code of Hammurabi*, § 142) the Hebrew woman had no legal right to leave her husband and no means of freeing herself.

The legal status of the Hebrew wife was lower than that of the wife in ancient Babylon, where, as regards property at least, she enjoyed a degree of independence (see HAMMURABI AND HIS CODE). In ancient Israel the wife was simply

8. Legal Status of Woman. a possession; but it must be added that her position had compensations. In bearing sons she gave to the tribe its most valuable possession; and the rights of the husband over her did not extend to her person. She was not a slave that he might sell, as he could his daughter; nor could he sell her handmaid that had become his concubine.

While her lot may have been a rather unhappy one, since a considerable part of the hardest work was imposed upon her, yet the Hebrew woman was by no means intellectually and morally in the position of the Mohammedan townswoman of the present. She had much more freedom, and there is no indication that she was secluded. The wife had her private rooms, which no strange man was allowed to enter (Judges xv. 1, xvi. 9;

9. Social Position of Woman. II Sam. xiii. 7; I Kings vii. 8); but she was by no means forbidden to associate with men and might even take part at banquets (Ex. xxi. 22; Deut. xxv. 11; Ruth ii. 5 sqq.; II Sam. xx. 16; Matt. ix. 20, xii. 46, xxvi. 7). Women enlivened the popular feasts with song and dance (Ex. xv. 20–21; Judges xvi. 27, xxi. 19 sqq.; I Sam. xviii. 6). As already mentioned, the position of the wife was gradually improved in the course of time; and in the account of creation J makes her the helpmate and equal of man. Still, the jealousy of the husband continued to deprive her of property-rights. Death by stoning was the penalty for adultery by the wife (Deut. xxii. 22 sqq.; cf. Exek. xvi. 40, and John viii. 5, 7). The suspecting husband could force his wife to submit to the ordeal of the bitter water (Num. v. 11 sqq.). The law imposing a penalty for false accusation of a wife (Deut. xxii. 13 sqq.) never became effective. However, this austerity did not prevent the prophets from complaining again and again about adultery (Jer. xxiii. 10, Hos. iv. 2; Mal. iii. 5, etc.).

Very little is known of wedding festivities among the Hebrews. The principal feature was the bringing of the bride into the home of the bridegroom. This ceremony signified the entrance of the girl into the family of the husband. On

10. Wedding Customs. the day of the wedding the bridegroom, in wedding-ornaments (Isa. lxi. 10) and accompanied by friends (Judges xiv. 11–12; cf. Matt. ix. 15), went to the home of the bride and conducted her to the home of the groom, or to that of his parents (Jer. vii. 34; Cant. iii. 6 sqq.; Matt. xxv. 1 sqq.). The bride was likewise ornamented but veiled (Isa. xlix. 18; Jer. ii. 32, etc.) and was accompanied by her girl friends (Ps. xlv. 14). Only seldom was the bride conducted to meet the bridegroom (I Macc. ix. 37–38). The wedding-banquet took place at the home of the groom; and in families of wealth and distinction this extended over a week or two (Gen. xxix. 27; Judges xiv. 12, 17; Tobit viii. 20).

The lot of the widow was a sad one. She had no hereditary rights whatever in her husband's property (similarly the *Code of Hammurabi*, § 172), but, in the earliest period, was a part of the estate. Even during his father's lifetime Reuben wanted to enter upon his inheritance (Gen. xxxv. 22), Absalom showed himself his father's successor by seizing David's harem (II Sam. xvi. 20 sqq.), Abner's intercourse with Saul's concubine was a trespass on the rights of Ish-bosheth (II Sam. iii. 7), and in Abishag Adonijah demanded

11. Legal Position of the Widow. a part of Solomon's inheritance (I Kings ii. 22; cf. 15). In spite of the law to the contrary, marriages with the stepmother were not unusual even to the time of Ezekiel (xxii. 10; cf. I Chron. ii. 24 in the Septuagint). The story of Ruth shows that, even if there were no children, the heir had to accept the widow along with the real estate, though not obliged to marry her. He might give her in marriage to another; or, if he chose, he might renounce the entire inheritance in favor of another heir (Ruth iv 5 sqq.). The story of Tamar illustrates the right of the heirs to the childless widow: Judah refused to marry her, but he retained his right over her and regarded her intercourse with other men as adultery (Gen. xxxviii. 24 sqq.). At the same time, the story shows that the right of the widow to

marry again was recognized. Yet these old customs fell more and more into disuse. Deuteronomy (xxv 7 sqq.) even allows the brother of the deceased to decline to marry his childless sister-in-law, a thing that was formerly a duty. Otherwise, this law is outspoken in the interest of the widow, assigning her legal rights (Deut. x. 18, xxiv. 17, xxvii. 19), and recommending her, together with the Levites and the poor, to the benevolent care of the people (Deut. xiv. 29, xvi. 11 sqq., xxiv. 19 sqq.). Not till a much later period were certain rights in the property of the deceased conceded to the widow, concerning which the rabbis promulgated detailed rules. The law determines nothing concerning a second marriage, except as to marriage with the brother-in-law.

12. The Levirate.

Intimately related to the hereditary right just discussed was the institution of the levirate. In the earliest period the right to inherit the widow had already become a duty to marry her if the deceased had left no sons. If there was no brother-in-law to marry her, this became the duty of the father-in-law or of the agnate who inherited, whoever he might be; and the first son of this marriage was regarded as the son of the deceased. Since levirate marriage is found chiefly among peoples who hold to ancestor-worship (Indians, Persians, Afghans, etc.), it is probable that herein lies the explanation of this institution in Israel. It is significant that the law in regard to such a marriage was made in favor of the deceased, not of the widow, the purpose being to provide him with descendants (Gen. xxxviii. 8; cf. II Sam. xviii. 18). After this form of belief had lost its significance the levirate marriage continued, having acquired new importance after the settlement in Canaan, in view of succession to property. At this time the custom served to secure the family property. Since the first son of a levirate marriage was reckoned to the deceased, this son inherited from his putative not from his real father. Thus was accomplished what the law had often attempted: the disintegration of property and its acquirement by strangers was prevented, and the family to which it belonged was perpetuated. Deuteronomy had limited this matrimonial duty of the brother of the deceased, allowing him to decline to marry the widow, but such a course brought him into disrepute. The ancient ceremony of the shoe is given an entirely different meaning in Deuteronomy: after having been publicly rejected by her brother-in-law the widow was to go with him to the proper authorities, tear his shoe from his foot and spit in his face (Deut. xxv. 5 sqq.). Later, in default of sons, daughters were given the right to inherit, that in this way the family estate might be preserved (Num. xxvii. 4); and then the levirate became limited to cases where the deceased had left no children at all. The priest-code tried to prohibit the custom entirely, as being incestuous (Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 21); but the ancient custom proved more potent than written law (Matt. xxii. 24 sqq.).

13. Desire for Children.

It was the heart's desire of the ancient Israelite to have numerous children. For a woman to be sterile was considered a great misfortune, even a punishment from God (I Sam. i. 5 sqq.); for as the mother of a son the wife held a position of distinction in the family (I Sam. i. 6–7; cf. Gen. xvi. 4, xxx. 1 sqq.). For the man to have no sons was even worse, since this threatened the extinction of his house. It is noteworthy that the custom of adopting a strange child, prevalent in ancient Babylon (*Code of Hammurabi*, §§ 185 sqq.) is not found in ancient Israel. Rather the slave was allowed to inherit (Gen. xv. 3). Sons were especially desired because they alone perpetuated the family and the family worship, since the daughters married into other families; and only the sons belonged to the *ḳahal*, "congregation," or body of men able to bear arms. Their precedence is shown especially by the fact that they alone could inherit (see LAW, HEBREW, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL), in contrast to the custom in ancient Babylon (cf. *Code of Hammurabi*, §§ 180 sqq.). However, these views were not peculiar to the Israelites, being found also among the Arabs. The fact that a girl could be sold into matrimony and was therefore not without value, formed a sort of counterpoise to the disdain in which she was usually held. At all events, no trace is found in the Old Testament of the thorough contempt for the girl prevalent among other peoples; and, so far as can be seen now, the custom of killing female infants, a frequent occurrence among Arabs, was never practised by the Hebrews.

The distinction between legitimacy and illegitimacy in their present significance did not exist. In so far as the father was known, all children were legitimate, whether borne by concubines or lawful wives (Gen. xxi. 10). Even Jephthah, the son of a prostitute and, in the strictest sense, illegitimate, was reared with the father's legitimate children; and if later these thrust him out it was only a case of might (Judges xi. 1 sqq.). The hereditary rights of such a son may not have been the same as that of the sons by lawful wives. There seems to have been no rigid custom regarding this, much depending upon the good-will of the father.

14. Customs at Birth.

The Israelitish women had the reputation of bearing children with great ease (Ex. i. 15 sqq.); though even in the earliest period they employed midwives (Gen. xxxv. 17; Ex. i. 15 sqq.). At the time of Jer. xx. 15 the father was not present at the accouchement. Job iii. 12 has been interpreted as expressing a symbolic act whereby the father acknowledged the child, similar to the custom of the Roman father of lifting the child from the floor as a token that it was to live. If this be correct, the passage is the only reminiscence of a former custom of child-murder. After the navel had been cut, the newly born babe was bathed in water, then rubbed with salt and wrapped in swaddling-clothes (Ezek. xvi. 4). The peasants of to-day think that salt strengthens the child; originally it probably had religious significance. The mother nursed the children herself (Gen. xxi. 7; I Sam. i. 22; I Kings iii. 21), and only exceptionally did she resort to nurses (Gen. xxiv. 59, xxxv. 8). This custom seems to have become more common later

with the wealthy (II Sam. iv. 4; II Kings xi. 2; cf. Ex. ii. 9). Nursing continued two or three years as in modern Palestine (cf. II Macc. vii. 27; according to the rabbis two years). Weaning was the occasion of a family celebration (Gen. xxi. 8; I Sam. i. 24). The birth of a child rendered the mother unclean (see DEFILEMENT AND PURIFICATION, CEREMONIAL). This notion, still common to uncivilized peoples, was generally held by ancient peoples. The foundation of this belief was either the view that child-birth was a disease and like other diseases, under the influence of certain demons; or else, that it was protected by some spirit, together with other processes of sexual life.

For circumcision and naming see CIRCUMCISION; NAMES.

15. Legal Status and Training of Children.

The father had almost unlimited power over his children. He could sell his daughter as a bride, or even as a slave, but not to foreigners (Ex. xxi. 7 sqq.). To assault or even curse the father was an offense deemed worthy of the death-penalty (Ex. xxi. 15, 17; for the later period cf. Lev. xx. 9; Prov. xx. 20; Matt. xv. 4). There is no mention of an age-limit to the father's authority, though in practise this was attained when the son married and founded a home. During the early years the education of the children was an affair of the mother (Prov. xxxi. 1). Boys and girls were left together in the harem where the girls remained till marriage. When the boys began to grow up they came under the care of the father, or, if the family was well-to-do, they might be entrusted to special tutors (Num. xi. 12; II Kings x. 1 sqq.; I Chron. xxvii. 32; Isa. xlix. 23). Special weight was laid upon early religious training (Ex. xiii. 8; Deut. iv. 9 sqq.); otherwise the main thing was to impart practical knowledge of some industry. The wealthier class also learned reading and writing, an art that was probably fairly well known at the time of Isaiah, and even earlier (Isa. viii. 1, x. 19; cf. Judges viii. 14). In the Old Testament there is no mention of a school. Not till a much later period were schools established, and then only in the larger cities (Josephus, *Ant.* XV., x. 5). After the exile particular stress was laid on the study of the law; and Deuteronomy contains numerous admonitions to instruct the children in the statutes and sacred history. Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus contain a sort of pedagogy. Stress was laid on education rather than instruction; and all knowledge was summed up in fear of God and obedience to parents (Prov. i. 7, and often). Strict discipline was to be maintained, nor was the rod to be spared (Prov. x. 17, xiii. 14, xxiii. 13, xxix. 17). These precepts applied to sons only.

16. Position of the First-born.

The first-born son occupied a position of distinction among the remaining children; and as heir he received a double portion. The father might deprive him of his prerogatives and put the favorite younger son in his place (Gen. xxi. 1 sqq., xlix. 3 sqq.; I Kings i. 11 sqq.); but custom did not approve of this, and later it was prohibited (Deut. xxi. 15 sqq.). In return it was the eldest son's duty to take care of the female members of the family, since he became the head of the family at his father's death. Unfortunately it is not known whether landed property was partitioned or whether it all went to the eldest son, who then settled in some way with his brothers. This custom rested upon a religious foundation. The first-born was thought to take a certain precedence in holiness, since in him the common blood of the tribe flowed in its purest state (Gen. xlix. 3; Deut. xxi. 17). This superiority was deduced from the particular claim of Yahweh to all the first-born (Ex. xxii. 29). The supposed sacred character of the first-born accounts for his consecration to the service of Yahweh (I Sam. i. 11, vii. 1). But usually the first-born was redeemed (Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20); for the worshipers of Yahweh had always opposed the sacrifice of children, a custom common among their Semitic neighbors (Gen. xxii.). The idea of dedicating the first-born to Yahweh was first introduced into the law in the Priest-code, according to which all first-born belonged to Yahweh. Since, however, the first-born in Israel could not always maintain the purity necessary for the service of the sanctuary, the Levites (q.v.) took their place (Num. iii. 39 sqq., viii. 16 sqq.).

I. BENZINGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best single book in English covering the whole subject is E. Day, *Social Life of the Hebrews*, New York, 1901. Of high value are: G. M. Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, London, 1898; Benzinger, *Archäologie;* Nowack, *Archäologie; DB*, i. 846–850, ii 341–342, iii. 262–277; *EB*, ii. 1498–1505, iii. 2942–51.

On the primitive institution: Smith, *Kinship* (the important book for Semites); idem, in *Journal of Philology*, ix. 75 sqq.; J. F. McLennan, *Primitive Marriage*, in *Studies in Ancient History*, London, 1876; G. A. Wilken, *Das Matriarchat bei den alten Arabern*, Leipsic, 1884; C. M. Starcke, *Primitive Family in its Origin and Development*, London, 1889; E. Westermarck, *Hist. of Human Marriage*, ib. 1901 (the standard work).

On Hebrew marriage: J. Selden, *Uxor Hebraica*, ib. 1546 (collects the Talmudic material); M. M. Kalisch, *Matrimonial Laws of the Hebrews*, in his *Commentary on Leviticus*, ib. 1872; C. Stubbe, *Die Ehe im A. T.*, Jena, 1886; J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, ii. 36–77, New York, 1896; T. Engert, *Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer*, Munich, 1906; F. Wilke, *Das Frauenideal und die Schätzung des Weibes im Alten Testament*, Leipsic, 1907.

Consult also: G. M. Redslob, *Die Levirats-Ehe bei den Hebräern*, Leipsic, 1836; D. W Amram, *Jewish Law of Divorce according to the Bible and Talmud*, London, 1897 (important); J. Simon, *L'Education des enfants chez les anciens Juifs*, Nimes, 1879; B. Strassburger, *Erziehung bei den Israeliten*, Stuttgart, 1885. For the Code of Hammurabi see the literature cited under HAMMURABI AND HIS CODE.

FAREL, fā″rel′, GUILLAUME: French Reformer; b. of noble family at Gap (46 m. s.s.e. of Grenoble) 1489; d. at Neuchâtel, Switzerland, Sept. 13, 1565. After finishing his studies in Paris he taught in the college of Cardinal le Moine, which was part of the University, and was led to adopt the Reformed views by his teacher Faber Stapulensis (q.v.) In 1521 he went to Meaux and preached the new faith. Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet was personally favorable to these views, but Farel's preaching was so direct and unsparing that it gave great offense to the adherents of the old Church and the bishop silenced him, Apr. 12, 1523. Thus early he exhibited a zeal which, much greater than his discretion, was to involve him in continual

trouble. After visiting Paris and Gap he wandered to Basel, where Œcolampadius received him as an ally and where he participated in the religious conference of Feb., 1524, and discussed the thirteen theses which he had prepared. (For text cf. Herminjard, *Correspondance*, i. 194). But his speeches and publications were so outspoken and incendiary that the authorities were alarmed and abruptly expelled him at Whitsuntide. He is next heard from at various places in southern Germany and Switzerland, preaching the Word with great boldness to French-speaking people and everywhere in imminent danger of his life. In Oct., 1532, he came to Geneva and was successful in inclining the authorities to adopt the Reformation by edict of Aug. 10, 1535. But he was not the man to conduct the difficult and delicate controversies, both religious and personal, which preceded and followed the adoption of the Reformation, as he was well aware. When, therefore, the rising theologian, John Calvin, in whom he divined the qualities which he lacked, came to Geneva, Farel laid hold upon him in a memorable interview in the latter part of July, 1536, and fairly compelled him to join in his work. But the opposition was too strong and they were both expelled from the city Apr. 23, 1538. Farel went to Neuchâtel and thence to Metz and the neighboring Gorze. In 1543 Gorze was attacked by the troops of the Cardinal of Lorraine and Farel barely escaped with his life. He went to Strasburg but soon after returned to Neuchâtel and for the remainder of his life made it the center of his activities.

Farel's publications have only relative importance and there is no collected edition of them. Carl Schmidt gives a list in his life of Farel, p. 38, to which should be added *Le résumé des actes de la dispute de Rive*, ed. by T. Dufour, Geneva, 1885.

Bibliography: For Farel's correspondence consult: the *Opera Calvini*, vols. x. 2–xx.; A. L. Herminjard's *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, 9 vols., Geneva, 1878–97. An Eng. transl. of letters to him by Calvin is given from Bonnet's text (2 vols., Paris, 1854), 4 vols., Philadelphia [1858].

His biography was written first anonymously, probably by Olivier Perrot, reprinted in G. E. von Haller, *Bibliothek der Schweizergeschichte*, iii., no. 781, 6 vols., Bern, 1785–88. Modern lives are by M. Kirchhofer, 2 vols., Zurich, 1831–33, Eng. transl., London, 1837; C. Schmidt, in *Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter . . . der reformirten Kirche*, vol. ix., Elberfeld, 1861; W. Blackburn, Philadelphia, 1865; G. Junod, Neuchâtel, 1865; G. Goguel, Montbéliard, 1873; F. Bevan, Lausanne, 1884, Eng. transl., London, 1893.

FARFA: A Benedictine abbey situated on the river Farfa, about half-way between Rome and Reate. It was established about the middle of the sixth century by Laurentius, bishop of Spoleto. Destroyed by the Lombards, it was restored by the priest Thomas of Maurienna in 681 and soon became one of the most famous monasteries of the Middle Ages. At the beginning of the tenth century, after a siege of seven years, it was destroyed by the Saracens. After lying desolate and deserted for forty-eight years it was restored by Hugo of Burgundy about 950, and later became notorious for the licentiousness and dissipation of its monks. However, toward the end of the tenth century the reform of Cluny was introduced at Farfa, and the monastery then gradually resumed its former importance. To this period belongs the *Chronicon Farfense*, written between 1105 and 1119 by Gregory of Catina, the librarian of the monastery. From the close of the fourteenth century the monastery was held *in commendam* by cardinals, and in 1842 Gregory XVI. annexed it to the cardinal-bishopric of Sabina.

Bibliography: Original sources for a history are in *MGH, Script.*, xi (1854), 519–590, and *MGH, Poetæ Latini ævi Carolini*, ii (1884), 654–655, cf. L. A. Muratori, *Rer. Ital. script.*, vol. ii., part ii., Milan, 1723. Consult: R. L. Poole, *English Historical Review*, v (1890), 581–585; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, pp. 75–76, Leipsic, 1894; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, ii (1886), 195, ii (1894), 220.

FARINDON, ANTHONY: Royalist minister; b. at Sonning (12 m. w. of Windsor), Berkshire, 1598 (baptized Dec. 24); d. in the country near London Oct. 9, 1658. He was educated at Trinity College, Oxford (B.A., 1616; M.A., 1620; B.D., 1629). In 1634 he was presented with the vicarage of Bray, and in 1639 with the divinity lectureship at the Chapel Royal, Windsor, but was deprived of both preferments during the civil war. In 1647, through the patronage of Sir John Robinson, he received the pastorate of St. Mary Magdalene's, in Milk Street, London, which he probably held till Jan. 1, 1656, when sequestered preachers were forbidden to preach in public. He has been pronounced the best preacher of his day. Of his 131 printed sermons, thirty-one were published by himself, *XXX. Sermons; to which is annexed a Sermon preached at the Funerall of Sir G. Whitmore* (London, 1657), the rest by his executors. There is a complete edition of his sermons with a *Life* by T. Jackson (4 vols., London, 1849).

Bibliography: Consult, beside the *Life* by Jackson, A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 457, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; *DNB*, xviii. 205–206.

FARLEY, JOHN MURPHY: Roman Catholic archbishop of New York; b. at Newton Hamilton, County Armagh, Ireland, Apr. 20, 1842. He was educated at St. Marcartan's College, Monaghan (1859–64), St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y. (1864–65), St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N. Y. (1865–66), and the American College, Rome (1866–1870). He was ordained to the priesthood in Rome in 1870, and after being assistant rector of St. Peter's, New Brighton, Staten Island, in 1870–72 was private secretary to Archbishop McCloskey until 1884, when he was appointed private chamberlain to Pope Leo XIII. with the title of monsignore, and in 1891 became vicar-general of the archdiocese of New York. In 1892 he was made domestic prelate of the pope, and in 1895 was appointed prothonotary apostolic and consecrated titular bishop of Zeugma and auxiliary bishop of New York. On the death of Archbishop Corrigan of New York in May, 1902, he was appointed administrator of the archdiocese, and five months later himself became archbishop.

FARMER, HUGH: Dissenting English minister and theological writer; b. near Shrewsbury Jan. 20, 1714; d. at Walthamstow (7 m. n.n.e. of London), Essex, Feb. 5, 1787. After studying five years (1731–36) in Philip Doddridge's academy in North-

ampton, he took charge of the congregation at Walthamstow in 1737, whose pastor he remained till 1780. In 1761 he removed to London, where he was afternoon preacher at Salter's Hall (1761–72) and also one of the preachers of the "merchants' lecture" on Tuesdays (1762–80). In 1762 he was elected a trustee of Dr. Williams' foundations and also a trustee of the Coward trust. His works, written in a vigorous style and characterized by more independence and freedom of thought than was usual in his day, exercised a decisive influence on current opinion. The principal ones are, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness* (London, 1761; 5th ed., 1822), in which he contends that our Lord's temptation was merely subjective, a divine vision; *A Dissertation on Miracles* (1771); *An Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament* (1775), in which he maintains that demoniacs are only persons afflicted with certain diseases; and *The General Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Ancient Heathen Nations* (1783).

Bibliography: M. Dodson, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Hugh Farmer*, London, 1804; A. Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, v. 664–665, ib. 1793; S. Palmer, *Nonconformists' Memorial*, iii. 492–493, ib. 1803; *DNB*, xviii. 211–213.

FARNOVIUS (FARNESIUS), STANISLAUS: Polish antitrinitarian; b. in the first half of the sixteenth century; d. apparently after 1622. The first event known in his life is that he was at Marburg in Mar., 1564, when Johannes Pincierius gave him a letter of recommendation to Bullinger. Two months later he matriculated at Heidelberg, but was already an Arian and was accordingly expelled. After the Synod of Lancut, Galicia, in 1567 he established and conducted a school in Sandec in the same province, separating from the Polish Unitarians who denied the preexistence of Christ and becoming the impassioned leader of the Arian Unitarians who asserted the preeminence of the Father over the Son, but admitted the preexistence of Jesus. He regarded the Holy Ghost as a person, but opposed any invocation of this member of the Trinity. In regard to the baptism of adults by immersion, he was in complete sympathy with the other Unitarians of Poland. After the death of Farnovius, his followers were absorbed by the great body of Unitarians or by the Calvinists. (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: The early life is by: V. Smalcius (d. 1622), printed in G. Zeltner, *Historia crypto-Sociniomi*, pp. 1158–1218, Leipsic, 1729. Consult: Stanislaus Lubieniecius, *Hist. reformationis Polonicæ*, Freistadt, 1685; C. Sandius, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, Freistadt, 1684; J. G. Walch, *Religionsstreitigkeiten . . ausser der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, iv. 142–143, Jena, 1736; F. S. Bock, *Hist. antitrinitariorum*, i. 334–340, Leipsic, 1774; H. Dalton, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Russland*, vol. iii., Berlin, 1898.

FARRAR, FREDERIC WILLIAM: Dean of Canterbury; b. at Bombay, India, Aug. 7, 1831; d. at Canterbury Mar. 22, 1903. He studied at King William's College, Isle of Man, King's College, London (B.A., 1852), and Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1854). He was ordered deacon in 1854 and ordained priest in 1857, and was assistant master in Marlborough College (1854) and Harrow School (1855–71), and head master of Marlborough College (1871–76). He was select preacher at Cambridge in 1868–69, 1872, 1874, and frequently afterward, honorary chaplain to the queen 1869–1873 and chaplain in ordinary after 1873, Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge in 1870, and Bampton Lecturer at Oxford in 1885. In 1876 he was installed rector of St. Margaret, Westminster, and canon of Westminster; and in 1883 was appointed archdeacon of Westminster and rural dean of St. Margaret and St. John the Evangelist. In 1890 he became chaplain to the House of Commons and in 1891 examining chaplain to the bishop of Worcester. In 1895 he was made dean of Canterbury. In all these positions he won distinction. As a teacher he had the admiration of his scholars, and as an ecclesiastic he discharged his duties with peculiar efficiency. His sermons, though written hastily and marked by a somewhat exuberant eloquence, were listened to by thousands. His rare powers of advocacy were specially devoted to the improvement of public school education and the cause of total abstinence.

Dean Farrar's publications were numerous and in varied fields. The earlier of them dealt with pedagogy and philology and included three famous stories of English school-life—*Eric* (Edinburgh, 1858), *Julian Home* (1859), and *St. Winifred's* (London, 1862). He prepared the commentary on Judges (1883) for Bishop Ellicott's commentary, Kings (1893–94) and Daniel (1895) for the *Expositor's Bible*, Wisdom (1888) for H. Wace's commentary on the Apocrypha, and Luke (1880) and Hebrews (1883) for the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* and for the *Cambridge New Testament*. Probably his best known book was his *Life and Work of St. Paul* (2 vols., London, 1879), though his *Life of Christ* (2 vols., 1874) passed through many editions. With these may be mentioned *The Early Days of Christianity* (2 vols., London, 1882); *The Messages of the Books* (1884); *Lives of the Fathers* (1889); and *The Life of Lives: Further Studies in the Life of Christ* (1900). His Hulsean and Bampton Lectures were published under the titles respectively of *The Witness of History to Christ* (1871) and *The History of Interpretation* (1886). Of his many volumes of sermons the most important was *Eternal Hope* (1878), containing five discourses preached in Westminster Abbey in 1877. Herein and in *Mercy and Judgment* (1881) he defended the doctrine that though there may be for some an endless hell because they resist the grace of God beyond the grave, there is no hell of material fire, and for the great majority, through God's mercy and Christ's sacrifice, a complete purification and salvation.

Bibliography: Reginald Farrar, *Life of Frederic William Farrar*, London, 1904 (by his son). A memoir by Dean William Lefroy of Norwich was prefixed to the *Life of Christ*, London, 1903. Consult also *Three Sermons preached in Cathedral of Christ Church, Canterbury, March 29, 1903, by A. J. Mason and others*, ib. 1903.

FAST-DAY: A day specially appointed for penitence and prayer. Repentance is a demand of God upon humanity which has fallen into sin. It ever remains the duty of the individual as well as

of the Christian congregation, and has at all times been acknowledged by the people of God, who give public expression to it by observing general fast-days, when the individual is reminded not only of his own sins, but also of the fact that his sin stands in the closest connection with the sin of the whole,—"Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it" (I Cor. xii. 26; Eph. iv. 16).

In Israel the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.) was a general fast-day and special fast-days are mentioned (Judges xx. 26; I Sam. vii. 5–6, xxxi. 13; Joel i. 13–14; Jonah iii.; Matt. xii. 41; see ATONEMENT, DAY OF; FASTING, I.). In the first centuries of the Christian Church Wednesdays and Fridays were fast-days, and special seasons of fasting arose (see FASTING, II.). In Protestant countries special fast-days have been appointed and annual fast-days have been instituted. For example, in Germany, the elector John George I. of Saxony ordered a day of general repentance and prayer in 1633 because of the misery following the Thirty Years' War, and at the outbreak of the Franco-German War in 1870 the king of Prussia appointed a fast-day for his realm. The number of annual fast-days has varied from one to four. As early as 1852 the effort was made to have a common fast-day for all Germany, and at present the Wednesday before the last Sunday after Trinity is so observed in Prussia and in most States of North and Central Germany. (J. L. SOMMER.)

Special Fast-days.

The New England Fast-day of the early settlers was an inheritance of Hebrew, Continental, and English custom, and has significance as indicating the recognition of divine providence in colonial affairs. The history of its observance naturally falls into two periods: (1) The period of special fasts, preceding 1694; (2) the period of regular annual fasts, since 1694 (in Massachusetts only to 1894). The story of New England fast-days begins at Plymouth, where a prolonged drought in the early summer of 1623 was the occasion of an order of the governor appointing July 16 (old style) as a day of humiliation and prayer, an event followed almost immediately by refreshing showers. In 1636 a new law code at Plymouth provided for the civil appointment of both fast and thanksgiving days as occasion should demand. In the Massachusetts Bay colony the first fast-days were church observances, and such were frequent in later history, entirely independent of civil appointment. The first fast-day sermon now extant in full was that of John Wheelwright, preached Jan. 19, 1637, in the midst of the Antinomian Controversy. Connecticut observed special fasts almost from the beginning. Various causes produced these particular appointments, such as drought, devastation of insect plagues or of epidemic diseases, Indian wars, earthquakes and religious indifference. The days were observed with scrupulous religiousness after the manner of the Puritan Sabbath, and after 1675 they were for some time made the occasion of a renewal of church covenants to promote spiritual reformation.

The New England Fast-days.

In the later years of the theocracy the practise prevailed of observing an annual fast-day in the spring. In Massachusetts this became fixed during the troublous years of charter alterations. In Plymouth it became regular after King Philip's War. In Connecticut it began even earlier. Out of deference to the Episcopal Church Connecticut made Good Friday the fast-day of the State in 1795, and it became the regular custom. New Hampshire had followed the same practise a few times, but like Maine was influenced by Massachusetts to adopt the first Thursday of April. Rhode Island has never adopted fast-day. The ministers of the colony were active in promoting the observance of the day; and after its appointment became purely a civil function their influence remained in the manner of observance and often in the wording of the proclamation. The character of the annual fast long remained religious. Until the nineteenth century two church services were held, occupying most of the day; and the people abstained from food until late afternoon. It was only later that they presumed to walk abroad, to visit, and even to indulge in sports. With the passing of time it took on a more secular, and even political character, until at last it was abolished in Massachusetts by act of the legislature Mar. 16, 1894. Its religious observance has been transferred in a measure to Good Friday, and its holiday features to Patriots' Day on Apr. 19. Fast-day never enjoyed permanent national observance, though on special occasions it has received recognition.

HENRY K. ROWE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. D. Love, *Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England*, Boston, 1895 (contains bibliography of sermons delivered on those days); J. B. Felt, in L. Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, Philadelphia, 1869. A very valuable collection of Fast and Thanksgiving Day Sermons is possessed by Union Theological Seminary, New York.

FASTIDIUS: One of the few literary representatives of the old British Church. Gennadius (*De vir ill.*, lvi.) says that "Fastidius, a bishop of the Britons, wrote a book on the Christian life to a certain Fatalis, and another on keeping widowhood sound in doctrine and worthy of God"; he places Fastidius between Pope Celestine I. (d. 432) and Cyril (d. 444). An extant writing *De vita Christiana* is ascribed in one manuscript to Fastidius, in another to Pelagius, in others to Augustine (printed in *MPL*, xl. 1031–46, as pseudo-Augustinian; in l. 383–402, as by Fastidius). The question of its authorship was first thoroughly investigated by C. P. Caspari (*Briefe, Abhandlungen, und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten des kirchlichen Altertums und dem Anfang des Mittelalters*, Christiania, 1890, 352 sqq.), who decides, because it is addressed to a woman and in other respects does not follow the notice in Gennadius, that the ascription to Fastidius can hardly be based upon this notice. The ascription to Pelagius has difficulties (Caspari, 371), and that to Augustine is out of the question. Morin (*Revue bénédictine*, xv. 481–490, 1898) has shown that the *Vita* was probably a work of Pelagius, that therefore Fastidius is the probable author of the five treatises attributed by Caspari to Agricola. The first of these is the *Vita*

mentioned by Gennadius. Whether Fastidius really wrote two books, as Gennadius says, must remain undecided. The *Vita Christiana* is pervaded by a Pelagian spirit and mode of thought, but this could easily have escaped Gennadius, since the author "indicates and betrays his Pelagianism rather than speaks it out openly and directly" (Caspari, 360). It also has points of contact with the letters of the Pelagian Agricola (Caspari, 375 sqq.; see AGRICOLA). The *Epist. ad fastidium* of Fastidius is in Pitra, *Analecta*, i. 134, sqq., Paris, 1888. (N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Wharton, *Hist. de episcopis et decanis Londinensibus*, p. 6, London, 1695; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, article "S. Germain"; Künstle, in *TQS*, lxxxii (1900), 193–204.

FASTING.

I. Hebrew.
II. In the Church.
Weekly Fasts (§ 1).
The Conception of Fasting (§ 2).
The Fast Before Easter (§ 3).
The Advent Fast (§ 4).
Other Fasts (§ 5).
Mode of Observance (§ 6).
The Present Practise (§ 7).

I. Hebrew: The word commonly used in Hebrew to express the idea of fasting is a common Semitic possession, is used by Arameans, Arabs, and Ethiopians, and appears in both the early and the late Old Testament writings (II Sam. xii. 16; Dan. ix. 3). In Isa. lviii. 3 "fasting" is in parallelism with "afflict the soul," a phrase often used to express the idea (Lev. xvi. 29, 31; Num. xxix. 7). The occasions of fasting among the Hebrews appear to have been three: (1) As a preparation for some religious duty. Thus Moses remained fasting on Sinai for forty days and nights when about to receive the tables of the decalogue (Ex. xxxiv. 28), and Daniel fasted for a considerable time before receiving his revelation (Dan. ix. 3, x. 2, cf. T. Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorans*, Göttingen, 1860). (2) As an accompaniment or manifestation of mourning. So the Jabesh-Gileadites and David mourned Saul (I Sam. xxxi. 13, II Sam. i. 12). The fact that David did not mourn after the death of his child by Bathsheba caused surprise in his attendants, and this suggests the customariness of fasting after a death. There was doubtless some religious significance in the act (cf. Wellhausen, *Heidentum*, p. 182). (3) As an act of self-abnegation and humility to conciliate deity (I Kings xxi. 28; Jer. xiv. 12). Specific cases are: David, when he feared the death of his child (II Sam. xii. 16); Ahab, to avert the disaster predicted by Elijah (I Kings xxi. 27–29); Nehemiah, over the sad condition of Jerusalem (Neh. i. 4); the whole people fasted in times of peril or misfortune (II Chron. xx. 3; Jer. xxxvi. 9; I Macc. iii. 47). In postexilic times the days on which disasters had occurred were celebrated as fast-days (Zech. vii. 3), and it became a manifestation of consciousness of sin (Neh. ix. 1; cf. I Kings xxi. 9). The fast was also employed to secure a happy issue out of dangerous circumstances (I Sam. xiv. 24; Esther iv. 16). By the Law only one fast was ordained, that of the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 29, cf. verse 21; see ATONEMENT, DAY OF). Accompaniments of the fast were ceremonies like the rending of clothing and placing of ashes on the head. The usual period of abstention was one day (I Sam. xxiv. 14), though it might be three days (Esther iv. 16) or during seven days from morning till evening (I Sam. xxxi. 13). In postexilic times the tendency was to multiply fasts, in face of the clear pronouncements of the prophets (cf. Isa. lviii. and Zech. vii. 5–6). See SYNAGOGUE. (F. BUHL.)

II. In the Church: The primitive Church took over the custom of fasting from Judaism. Jesus did not oppose the practise which he found prevalent (see above); he condemned only the ostentatious fasting of the Pharisees (Matt. vi. 16–18). From Judaism also the Church took the oldest injunctions concerning Christian fasting. The

1. Weekly Fasts. Jews had observed Monday and Thursday as fast-days, and whoever wished to fast did so on those two days, though there was no general command to fast. There were also optional fast-days. The Gentile-Christian Churches appointed Wednesday and Friday. That from the beginning two days were thus distinguished shows the dependence on Judaism, although a protest is also evidenced by the change of days. In the time of Paul no definite Christian custom seems to have existed (Rom. xiv. 5–6), but there was one by the time of the *Didache* (viii. 1). In Tertullian's day the optional character of fast-days was still emphasized (*De oratione*, xviii.); later they became obligatory, and all that was left to the individual was the extent of the fast. It usually lasted to the ninth hour. Fasting was based in principle upon the suffering of Christ. The commemoration of the death of Jesus on Friday seems to be very old, and it is possible that from the beginning (cf. Mark ii. 20), as the resurrection of Jesus was commemorated every Sunday, so was his death every Friday. For the observance of Wednesday it was not so easy to find such a motive; and the various artificial derivations of the usage from the history of the Passion, designating it as the day on which Jesus was betrayed, or on which the Sanhedrin decided to kill him, are obviously later justifications of the choice of a day. From the beginning of the third century a third weekly fast, on Saturday, was instituted in Rome. The explanation of this varies. The statement is clearly legendary that Peter before his struggle with Simon Magus induced the Church at Rome to fast with him on Saturday, and that this practise had been maintained ever since (Cassian, *De institutis cœnobiorum*, iii. 10). But it is not impossible that the Saturday fast was considered a weekly repetition of the fast before Easter, as Innocent I. (*Epist.*, xxv. 4) and Augustine (*Epist.*, xxxvi. 21) state. It is possible, too, that an anti-Jewish temper may have led to the institution, and that afterward, because the Jews celebrated Saturday as a festival, the Christians dishonored it by fasting. The Roman custom did not spread widely. The East always declined to adopt it and from the end of the fourth century considered Saturday as well as Sunday a holy day. Even Milan refused to adopt the Roman custom, and in Africa it was observed only here and there (Augustine, *Epist.*, xxxvi. 31). When in the West three fast-days in the week appeared too many, Wednesday, not Saturday, was given up. But the most important and solemn fast-day was always Friday.

The conception of fasting was the one generally customary in antiquity. It was considered an exercise of piety, not directly required by God but pleasing to him, like almsgiving and prayer. Mechanical formalism was occasionally opposed by the remark that a devout life is more important than frequent fasting (Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudo*, v.). How accurately the performance was balanced may be seen from the linguistic distinction between *statio*, "a half-fast," *jejunium*, "a complete fast," and *superpositio*, "an additional fast" (till the next day). And how strictly the rule was adhered to may be seen from the fact that it was even thought necessary to abstain from the Lord's Supper on fast-days (Tertullian, *De oratione*, xix.). Every personal misfortune induced pious Christians to abstain from food and drink, and in a general calamity, such as a persecution, the bishops usually appointed a fast-day for the Church; in both cases the regular days were usually chosen. The length to which some went is seen from the prohibition of fasting on holy days, on Sunday, and in the time between Easter and Pentecost, on the ground that fasting is a sign of sorrow and consequently incompatible with festal seasons. The connection between alms and fasting was early emphasized by the custom of giving to the poor provisions saved on fast-days.

2. The Conception of Fasting.

Abstinence from eating and drinking before religious rites and sacred festivals springs from another conception. It is a very old and widespread belief that with food demons enter into the body of man. Hence he who wishes to have intercourse with God, must be abstemious in order to become a pure vessel of the Spirit. For this reason the prophet prepares himself by fasting for the revelation (Shepherd of Hermas, *Visio*, ii. 2, iii. 1, 10); and concerning exorcism it is written (Matt. xvii. 20) "This kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting." [This verse is omitted in the critical text, and the word "fasting" is omitted in the parallel, Mark ix. 29]. Absolution and ordination were preceded by a fast. In the *Didache* (vii. 4) both the baptizer and the candidate fast before baptism; and the Lord's Supper was to be received fasting. Out of such ideas the fast before Easter developed. Easter is the only very ancient annual festival of the Church, and to appoint a general fast before it was only to observe a custom which was everywhere considered a matter of course. The first clear evidence of the custom occurs in the second century. Here only the day before was observed as a fast-day, there two or more days; others again fasted for forty hours (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., xxiv. 12–13). Appeal was made to Matt. ix. 15 and this fast was regarded as a sacred obligation of every Christian. On the basis of the passage cited, the duration of the fast seems to have been made coextensive with the time of Christ's resting in the grave. On the night before Easter the faithful assembled in the church. With the moment at which Christ rose the fasting ceased, and the Paschal Eucharist was celebrated (Syriac *Didascalia*, xxi.). In the course of the third century the fast was extended to the six days of Holy Week, but the innovation was combined with the ancient custom by making the fasting on the last two days stricter. At the beginning of the fourth century, in the time of the great persecution, the forty days' fast was introduced, on the analogy of the forty days' fast of Jesus (Matt. iv. 2), of Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 28) and of Elijah (I Kings xix. 8). The oldest testimony for the Quadragesima is the fifth canon of the Council of Nicæa (325); in the West it is found first in the time of Ambrose. Again a combination of the new with the old was attempted by making Holy Week a special time of fasting. But it was done in different ways. Athanasius includes the "six holy and great days" in the Quadragesima, and makes Lent begin with the Monday after the first Sunday in Lent, all days, even Saturday and Sunday (except Palm Sunday), being fast-days, so that he gets precisely forty days. Epiphanius, on the other hand, makes the forty days' fast precede the six days' fast, and, as with him Sundays are not fast-days, Lent begins on Sexagesima-Sunday, eight weeks before Easter (*Hær.*, lxxv. 6; *De fide*, xxii.). In the Apostolic Constitutions also (v. 13), the forty days precede the Passover fast; but the Saturdays too are excepted, so that only five days in the week remain. The distinction between the two seasons of fasting seems to have disappeared by the end of the fourth century, so that the forty days of Lent are the regular fast days before Easter. Though the custom of different churches varied in the fourth century, in the fifth a certain amount of harmony was reached by fixing the fast either at six or at seven weeks according as Saturday was treated as a fast-day or a holy day (Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 19). Rome observed six weeks, beginning with the Monday after the first Sunday in Lent. In the seventh century the fast was made to begin with the Wednesday after Quinquagesima, or Ash Wednesday. This is the present custom of the Latin Church. In the East the fast-season was also extended in the seventh century from seven to eight weeks, which, with five fast-days in each, makes up the total of forty. But a trace of the older custom is still visible in the treatment of the first or "Butter Week" [so called because in it butter, milk, and eggs are allowed] as a sort of preparatory fast. See Ash Wednesday; Holy Week; and Lent).

3. The Fast before Easter.

From the middle of the fourth century the birth of Jesus was celebrated on Dec. 25, first in Rome, and before the end of the century in the East also. It was but natural that, like Easter, the new high festival should also be preceded by a forty days' fast. The reckoning of the forty days differed in the East and the West, according as Saturday was considered a holy day or a fast-day. Milan and the entire territory of the Gallican liturgy followed the East. The fast commenced there with St. Martin's day, Nov. 11, and Advent was therefore called *Quadragesima Martini*; nowadays Advent commences in the East on Nov. 15. The Roman custom appointed a shorter time and

4. The Advent Fast.

afterward reduced the original time still further to the present four weeks.

In the Greek Church there is another season of fasting preparatory to the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul on June 29. This also was originally intended to be a period of forty days; but since that would have conflicted with the feast of Pentecost, its beginning was fixed for the Monday after the octave of that feast, which reduces it in some years to only nine days. There is evidence of a fast after the long festal season from Easter to Pentecost from the end of the fourth century in different parts of the Church, Western as well as Eastern, apparently connected to some extent with the feast of the apostles, though no trace of it now remains in the West beyond the single day's vigil. A fast before Epiphany was customary in the fourth century within the domain of the Gallican liturgy, in northern Italy, France, Spain, so far as the ecclesiastical power of Milan then reached. It seems to owe its origin to a rivalry with the Roman Christmas festival; as the latter had its fast, so it was thought necessary that the older Epiphany festival on Jan. 6 must have its fast too. The fast of the Virgin is the most recent of the four great fasts of the Greeks. The festival of the death of Mary, Aug. 15, was introduced by the Emperor Maurice (582–602); the fast lasts from Aug. 1 to Aug. 15. On the other hand the ember fast is a Roman custom. The *quattuor tempora*, according to Leo I., occur before Easter, before Pentecost, in September and in December. The exact date has been differently fixed; since Urban II. (1095), they fall in the weeks after the first Sunday in Lent, Pentecost, the Exaltation of the Cross (Sept. 14), and St. Lucy's day (Dec. 13). They are observed by fasting on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, the three ancient Roman fast-days. The meaning seems to have been originally that of supplication for a blessing on the fruits of the earth. In some countries the second ember-season was referred to the corn-harvest, the third to the vintage, the fourth to the olive-harvest, and the first was omitted.

5. Other Fasts.

The mode of observing the fasts was various even in the oldest times. In considering the large number of fast-days observed in the first Christian centuries, it must not be forgotten that the population of the South, and especially that of the East is satisfied with meager and primitive food, and hardly knows any regular times for meals. None the less, the requirement of fasting during the whole of Lent seemed too difficult, and even in the fourth century all Christians were not enjoined to fast during the whole forty days. Most fasted two or three weeks (Chrysostom, *Hom. xvi. ad popul. Antiochen.*). By fasting was generally understood abstinence from all food till evening, or one meal a day; and this was to be as simple as possible. In the first centuries only bread, salt, and water was allowed. Afterward fruits and eggs, sometimes fish and even poultry were allowed, so that the fasting was finally limited to a prohibition of flesh and wine (Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, v. 22). To limit thus the enjoyment of food to the barest necessities, or to refrain from certain designated articles of food constitutes " abstinence " in the technical sense. The injunctions were at first only of local or provincial authority. During the Middle Ages a vast system of casuistry developed in the Roman Church touching upon questions of permitted and forbidden food, indulgences and dispensations. In the fourth century (canons l., li. of the Council of Laodicea, c. 360) ecclesiastical legislation made Lent a *tempus clausum*, by prohibiting anniversaries of martyrs, weddings, and birthday celebrations.

6. Mode of Observance.

At present the laws of the Greek Church are stricter than those of the Roman. It still observes, besides the four great seasons of fasting, also the vigils of the Epiphany, St. John Baptist's day and Holy Cross day, and the weekly fast on Wednesday and Friday; so that half of the year is spent in fasting. The people are said as a rule to observe the fasts with strictness, but the educated classes have in large measure emancipated themselves from these regulations, and even the clergy are not enthusiastic advocates of their observance. In the Roman Catholic Church the influence of changed social conditions and climate has brought about a mitigation of the law of fasting. Advent has partially lost its character as a season of fasting, and the rules for Lent are generally very lenient. The ember-days are still observed. Of the three weekly fast-days Friday is retained, though as a day not of strict fasting but of abstinence from meat. The Church of Rome cares less for the amount of fasting than for the act of obedience performed by its members in observing its rules on this point. [These vary considerably in different places. Speaking generally, the obligation of fasting is not imposed upon any persons under twenty-one or over sixty; and those who are bound to fast are allowed to take, besides the one meal a day of the older use, a small piece of bread with tea or coffee in the morning, and a light meal or collation in the evening. The fast before communion, on the other hand, is absolute, not allowing even a drop of water from the preceding midnight.]

7. The Present Practise.

In the Lutheran Church the fast-seasons are continued in days appointed for penance and prayer (see FAST-DAY). They are generally observed about the time of the old fast-days, e.g., the ember-days, or are specially appointed on account of public calamities, great wars, destructive storms, and the like. Lent is still spoken of as a season of fasting, and is considered by stricter Protestants as a time in which music, dancing, games, public amusements, and weddings are prohibited. In many places the people still abstain from eating and drinking before receiving the Lord's Supper; otherwise fasting is considered a Roman Catholic practise. [Calvin, whose views were generally adopted by the Reformed churches, commends the practise of fasting, if guarded against superstition; and the Westminster Confession says that " solemn fastings " are " in their times and seasons " to be used in a holy and religious manner.

Thus in Scotland it was long customary to observe a yearly fast on some day in the week preceding the Communion Sunday: but the religious side of this observance has largely fallen into disuse, and the day has become merely a public holiday. For the history of the New England usage, derived from the Puritans, see FAST-DAY. The Church of England has a table of fasts in its Prayer-book, including all Fridays, Lent, the ember-days, and certain vigils, but merely enjoins a special measure of devotion and abstinence on these days, laying down no precise law for their observance.]

H. ACHELIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: I. Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 165, 464, 477; Nowack, *Archäologie*, ii. 270 sqq.; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 489–491 and consult the indexes of original and of Eng. transl.; Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, pp. 433–434; *BD*, i. 854–855; *EB*, ii. 1505–08; *KL*, iv. 1251–52.

II. A list of early treatises, mostly in Latin, is in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, v. 770, and in J. E. Volbeding, *Index dissertationum*, pp. 119–120, Leipsic, 1849. The best treatment of the subject is L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, Eng. transl., London, 1904. Consult: Bingham, *Origines*, book xxi.; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, x. 309–420; H. Liemke, *Die Quadragesimal-Fasten der Kirche*, Munich, 1853; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, pp. 270–275, London, 1870; A. Linsenmayr, *Entwicklung der kirchlichen Fastendisziplin*, Munich, 1877; F. X. Funk, in *Kirchengeschichtlichen Abhandlungen*, pp. 241–278, Paderborn, 1897; T. Zahn, *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, pp. 359–360, 368–373, Erlangen, 1898; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 371–373; *DCA*, i. 661–665; *KL*, iv. 1241–51.

FATALISM: The doctrine that all events are determined by fate, instead of by natural causes, and that nothing that man can will or do affects the course of events. While in the fatalistic view of the world everything is ruled by necessity, this is quite a different kind of necessity from that of Determinism (q.v.), with which fatalism is often confused. Indeed, fatalism and determinism are diametrically opposed to one another. The determinist, or necessitarian, says that events take place with necessity, but that they are made necessary by events immediately preceding, to which they stand in a relation of cause and effect. The fatalist, on the other hand, eliminates natural causes entirely. In his view the ultimate result will remain the same, no matter how much the antecedent causes be varied. For example, believing that a blind fate has decreed his death at a certain time, the fatalistic soldier goes into the battle with the firm conviction that he will not meet his death a moment sooner than if he had stayed at home. While fatalism bears a resemblance to predestination it is essentially a heathen view, and leaves no room for freedom of the will, or for any personal relation between man and God the Father. Fatalism appears in Greek philosophy, and sometimes in modern pantheism, but it has found its fullest expression in the fanaticism of Mohammedanism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Abbé Plouquet, *Examen du fatalisme*, Paris, 1757; A. Monod, *Le Fatalisme*, ib. 1858; B. Conta, *Théorie du fatalisme*, Brussels, 1877; D. Bosurgi, *Il Fatalismo e . libertà morale*, Catania, 1893; A. Lalande, in *Revue philosophique*, xlii (1896), 225 sqq.

FATHERS OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. See CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, SOCIETY OF.

FATHERS OF THE CHURCH. See CHURCH FATHERS; PATRISTICS, PATROLOGY.

FAUCHET, fō″shê′, **CLAUDE** (**Abbé Fauchet**): French bishop and revolutionist; b. at Dornes (21 m. s.s.e. of Nevers), Department of Nièvre, Sept. 22, 1744; executed in Paris Oct. 31, 1793. He devoted himself to the Church and soon became famous as an orator. He was grand vicar of the archbishop of Bourges, preacher to the king, and abbé of Montfort-Lacarre, in Brittany. In 1788 he was deprived of his office as preacher to the king on account of his revolutionary views; and on July 14, 1789 he was one of the leaders in the attack on the Bastile. He was a member of the Commune, and was chosen by that body to deliver an *Éloge civique de Benjamin Franklin* (Paris, 1790). His *De la religion nationale* (Paris, 1789), led to his appointment as constitutional bishop of Calvados in 1791. The same year he was elected deputy to the legislative assembly, afterward to the convention. At first a Jacobin, he was forced by the execution of the king, which he had opposed, to side with the Girondists. He was arrested on July 18, 1793, and guillotined with the Girondist deputies on Oct. 31. Besides publishing a number of revolutionary addresses, he edited *La Bouche de Fer* and the *Journal des Amis*. His *Œuvres choisies* are in J. P. Migne's *Collection des orateurs sacrés*, vol. lxvi.

FAUCHEUR, fō″shūr′, **MICHEL LE:** French Protestant preacher; b. at Geneva 1585; d. in Paris Apr. 1, 1657 At eighteen he began preaching at Dijon and early won a great reputation as an orator. He was pastor at Montpellier 1612–32, and from 1636 till his death he preached at Charenton. In the interim he had been reduced to silence by Richelieu, who was trying to unite the two branches of the Church. Besides a large number of sermons, which are still worth reading, he published, *Traité de la Cène* (Geneva, 1635); and *Traité de l'action de l'orateur* (Paris, 1637). A translation of his sermon, " The Wages of Sin and the Reward of Grace " is found in Ingram Cobbin's *The French Preacher* (London, 1816).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Tallemant des Reaux, *Les Historiettes*, Paris, 1834–35; A. R. Vinet, *Hist. de la prédication*, Paris, 1860.

FAULHABER, faul-hā′ber, **MICHAEL:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Heidenfeld (18 m. n.e. of Würzburg) Mar. 5, 1869. He studied in Würzburg (D.D., 1895), and after being prefect of the theological seminary in the same city, 1893–95, spent the years 1896–98 in libraries in Rome and other Italian cities. He became privat-docent in the University of Würzburg in 1899, and in 1903 was appointed professor of Old Testament exegesis in the University of Strasburg. He has written *Die griechischen Apologeten der klassischen Väterzeit, i., Eusebius* (Würzburg, 1896); *Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften* (Freiburg, 1899); *Hesychii Hierosolymitani interpretatio Isaiæ prophetæ* (1900); *Hohelied-, Proverbien- und Prediger-Catenen* (Vienna, 1902); and *Die Vesperpsalmen der Sonn- und Feiertage* (Strasburg, 1906).

FAULKNER, JOHN ALFRED: Methodist Episcopalian; b. at Grand Pré, N. S., July 14, 1857 He was graduated at Acadia College, Wolfville, N. S., in 1878 and at Drew Theological Seminary in 1881, supplementing his studies at Andover Theological Seminary and the universities of Leipsic and Bonn. He entered the Methodist Episcopal ministry in 1883 and held pastorates at Beach Lake, Pa. (1883–84), Yatesville, Pa. (1884–85), Park Place, Scranton, Pa. (1885–87), Taylor, Pa. (1887–92), Great Bend, Pa. (1892–94), and Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y. (1894–97). Since 1897 he has been professor of historical theology in Drew Theological Seminary. He has written *The Methodists* (New York, 1903), *Cyprian* (Cincinnati, O., 1906), and *Erasmus* (1908).

FAUNCE, WILLIAM HERBERT PERRY: Baptist; b. at Worcester, Mass., Jan. 15, 1859. He was graduated at Brown University in 1880 and Newton Theological Institution in 1884. He was instructor in mathematics in Brown University 1881–82, and was pastor of the State Street Baptist Church, Springfield, Mass., 1884–89 and of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York City, 1889–99. Since 1899 he has been president of Brown University. He was elected president of the Religious Education Association in 1906. He lectured before the Divinity School of the University of Chicago in 1898–99 and has been a resident preacher at Harvard University. He has written *Roger Williams and his Doctrine of Soul Liberty* (Boston, 1902).

FAUSSET, ANDREW ROBERT: Church of England; b. near Enniskillen (75 m. w.s.w. of Belfast), county Fermanagh, Ireland, Oct. 13, 1821. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1843), was ordered deacon in 1847, and ordained priest in 1848, and was curate of Bishop Middleham, Durham, 1847–59. Since 1859 he has been rector of St. Cuthbert's, York, and has been canon of York Minster since 1885. He was chaplain at Bex, Switzerland, in 1870 and at St. Goar on the Rhine in 1873. In theology he belongs to the Evangelical school of the Church of England. He has written *Scripture and the Prayer Book in Harmony* (London, 1854); *Horæ Psalmicæ* (1877); *The Englishman's Critical and Expository Cyclopædia* (London, 1878); *The Church and World* (1878); *The Millennium* (1880); *The Signs of the Times* (1881); *Prophecy a Sure Light* (1882); *The Latter Rain* (1883); *True Science Confirming Genesis* (1884); *The Personal Antichrist* (1884); *Spiritualism* (1885); *Critical and Expository Commentary on the Book of Judges* (1885); and *Guide to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer* (1894). He has edited various classical authors as well as the English translation of J. A. Bengel's *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1857–58), and A. R. Vinet's *Homilétique* (London, 1858), and wrote the second and fourth volumes of *The Critical and Explanatory Pocket Bible* (4 vols., Glasgow, 1862), and the third, fourth, and sixth volumes of the *Critical, Experimental, and Practical Commentary* (6 vols., London, 1871).

FAUSTINUS: Presbyter at Rome under Pope Liberius (352–366), prominent in the Luciferian agitation (see LUCIFER OF CALARIS AND THE LUCIFERIANS). Conjointly with the otherwise unknown presbyter Marcellinus, he delivered to the emperor Theodosius at Constantinople in 383 or 384 a document (*Libellus precum ad imperatores*) entitled *De confessione veræ fidei et ostentatione sacræ communionis et persecutione adversantium veritatis* (*MPL*, xiii. 83–107; *CSEL*, xxxv. 5–44), wherein he defended the Luciferians and entreated the emperor for protection against their adversaries. His deductions are largely overdrawn and partizan. The *præfatio* to this memorial is not the work of Faustinus, but of an Ursinian (see URSINUS, ANTIPOPE). Another work by Faustinus is the unimportant tract, *De trinitate sive fidei adversus Arianos* (*MPL*, xiii. 37–80).

G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, chap. xvi.; Isidore of Spain, *De vir. ill.*, chap. xiv.; G. Krüger, *Lucifer von Calaris*, pp. 62–63, 82–86, 94 sqq., Leipsic, 1886; G. Rauschen, *Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche unter Theodosius*, pp. 140, 199–200, Freiburg, 1897; *DCB*, ii. 466.

FAUSTUS OF MILEVE. See MANICHEANS, § 14.

FAUSTUS OF RIEZ (Lat. *Reji; Faustus Rejensis*): Prominent representative of Semi-Pelagianism in the south of Gaul; b. between 405 and 410; d. toward the end of the fifth century. He was probably of British origin, according to the positive assertions of Avitus and Sidonius; against this there is nothing but the description of him as a Gaul by men at a distance like Possessor and Facundus. He received a good philosophical education, and knew not a little of the Scriptures, but he was neither an original thinker nor a thorough theologian. At an early age he entered the monastery of Lérins (q.v.), then in a very flourishing state under Abbot Maximus, whom he succeeded in 433. He kept his monks in strict discipline, and defended the interests of his monastery against the bishop of the diocese, Theodore of Fréjus, winning his case when it came before a synod held by the metropolitan Ravennius (the Third Synod of Arles, probably in 456). He was subsequently chosen bishop of Riez (in Basses Alpes, 50 m. n.e. of Marseilles), not later than 462, in which year he appears in Rome as a bishop; the date of his election is probably between 458 and 460. He continued to distinguish himself by his ascetic life, and became known as a preacher. A synod was held at Arles c. 475 to deal with the case of Lucidus, a teacher of thoroughgoing predestinarianism, and another one soon after at Lyons. Acting at the request of these synods, Faustus succeeded in inducing Lucidus to sign a fairly complete retractation, and also wrote a large work *De gratia* in which he took a Semi-Pelagian position. He was also a prominent figure in the Christological and Pneumatological controversies of his day. In 474, with other bishops, he conducted negotiations in the emperor's name with Euric, king of the Visigoths, and later, probably by Euric's conquests, was driven into an exile which apparently terminated in the year of Euric's death, 485. His own death probably followed from five to ten years later. The Church of his province

Life.

honored him as a saint, although the title was not sanctioned by the wider body on account of his Semi-Pelagian teachings.

In his catalogue of authors Gennadius gives a list, avowedly incomplete, of the writings of Faustus [*NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 399]. This includes first a treatise in two books *De Spiritu sancto*, defending the divinity of the Holy Ghost against Macedonius, and the two books *De gratia*, in the extant text of which there are evident gaps; and Bergmann brings forward, though unconvincingly, the theory that it has suffered from interpolations of an Augustinian tendency. Gennadius further mentions "a small book against the Arians and the Macedonians," which, in spite of various attempts at identification, may be taken as lost; another "against those who say that there is something incorporeal in creatures, affirming by Scriptural and patristic testimony that there is nothing incorporeal except God," which is extant as the fourth epistle of Faustus; a letter addressed "to a certain deacon named Græcus who, leaving the Catholic faith, went over to the Nestorian impiety"; and "a religious epistle to Felix, the pretorian prefect, exhorting to the fear of God," given by Engelbrecht as *Epist.* vi., and related to his *Epist.* ix. Besides those mentioned by Gennadius, there are other letters undeniably authentic—that to Paulinus of Burdegala (*Epist.* v. in Engelbrecht), that to Lucidus (*Epist.* i.), and five to Ruricius (viii.–xii.). Of special interest are the two homilies on the baptismal symbol, which since Caspari's investigations have been generally attributed to Faustus, although more recently W. Bergmann, *Studien zu einer kritischen Sichtung der südgallischen Predigtlitteratur der 5. und 6. Jahrhunderten*, Leipsic, 1898, has contested this attribution, on grounds which are worthy of notice if not conclusive. It remains to mention a large number of sermons which are said to have been current, although the obscurity which still rests upon the whole question of early Latin homiletical literature prevents the determination of the exact extent of this activity. Engelbrecht, indeed, asserts that there are extant two collections of the sermons of Faustus, one of twenty-two in the ninth or tenth century manuscript known as Durlach 36 (now Carlsruhe 340), and seventy-four originally attributed to Eusebius (printed in the *Bibliotheca maxima*, VI. 618 sqq.). But this assumption is hazardous. In the Durlach codex, nine sermons bear the name of Faustinus, but it is both uncertain whether this name points to Faustus and whether the remaining sermons are even by the same author; while both here and in the other collection certain sections may be certainly identified as the work of Cæsarius.

Writings.

The historical position of Faustus is conditioned by his support of the Semi-Pelagian theology (see SEMI-PELAGIANISM). According to him, all men are born in original sin; but although the freedom of the human will is weakened by sin, it yet remains an integral part of human nature even in the sinner. Grace cooperates with free will to establish good in man; but man, through his freedom, takes the initial step. In Faustus' mind grace connotes practically preaching with its promises and warnings; grace as an *adjutorium divinum*, in the Augustinian conception, an interior transforming power, is unknown to him. The passages which seem to recognize such a power are to be explained by the fact that Faustus regards the natural power of the will as a gift of grace, or looks upon the leadings of the circumstances of life in something of the same light, as in his treatment of the parable of the prodigal son. In spite of a casual mention (in the same sense) of *gratia cooperans* or *cooperans adjutorium*, and of his strong condemnation of Pelagius, he really takes a Pelagian position, further removed than Cassian from Augustine. Predestination is made dependent on foreknowledge. God wills only what is just and right, but permits freedom to terminate in evil. In Trinitarian and Christological questions Faustus adheres to the orthodox Augustinian formulas. (R. SEEBERG.)

Theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The handiest ed. of the writings of Faustus is by Engelbrecht, in *CSEL*, xxi., Vienna, 1891; the most important are in *MPL*, lviii. 783 sqq.; the letters of Faustus and Ruricius, ed. Krusch, are in *MGH*, *Auct. ant.*, viii (1887), 265 sqq., cf. pp. liv. sqq.; for his exposition of the creed consult C. P. Caspari, *Ungedruckte . . Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, ii. 183 sqq., Christiania, 1869; idem, *Anecdota*, i. 315 sqq., ib. 1883; and the tract *De symbolo*, ed. Caspari, is in *Alte und Neue Quellen*, ib. 1879. Consult: A. Koch, *Der heilige Faustus*, Stuttgart, 1895; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xvi. 408 sqq.; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ii. 585 sqq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, x. 420–437; A. Engelbrecht, *Studien über die Schriften des Bischofs von Reji, Faustus*, Vienna, 1889; *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, 1890, pp. 289 sqq., 481 sqq., 677 sqq.; Morin, in *Revue bénédictine*, ix (1892), 49 sqq., cf. viii (1891), 97 sqq.; C. F. Arnold, *Cäsarius von Arelate*, pp. 324 sqq., Leipsic, 1894; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 706–707 et passim; Harnack, *Dogma*, iv. 314, v. 252 sqq. et passim; *KL*, iv. 1279–81.

FAVRE, fā'vr, **PIERRE (PETRUS FABER):** Jesuit; b. at Villardet (now Villard, 3 m. w. of Beaufort), Savoy, Apr. 13, 1506; d. at Barcelona Aug. 1, 1546. He was one of the seven original associates of Ignatius Loyola (q.v.), who took with him the solemn vow Aug. 15, 1534, in Paris. He was the first to gather followers in Germany, and he educated them by the *Exercitia Spiritualia* (q.v.) while he was attending the religious colloquies of Worms (1540) and Regensburg (1541). During his residence at Cologne (1543–44), as is clear from the first volume of his *Cartas y otros escritos* (Bilbao, 1894), he vigorously opposed Archbishop Herman of Wied (q.v.), who inclined toward Protestantism. He then began a successful propaganda in behalf of his order in Portugal and Spain, and was appointed to take part in the sessions of the Council of Trent, but died at Barcelona on his journey thither. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. The "Letters and Literary Works" of Favre were published, 2 vols., Bilbao, 1894, vol. ii. contains also the *Memoriale*, ed. M. Bouix, Paris, 1874. Consult. R. Cornely, *Leben des seligen Petrus Faber*, Freiburg, 1873; E. Gothein, *Ignatius von Loyola*, pp. 265 sqq., 663 sqq., Halle, 1895.

FAVRE (FABER), PIERRE FRANÇOIS: Roman Catholic; b. at St. Barthelemi, canton of Vaud, Switzerland, in the beginning of the eighteenth century; d. at Assens in the district of Echallens, canton of Vaud, about 1780. He became priest at

Lauden, in Lower Languedoc, and accompanied François de la Baume, bishop of Halicarnassus, on a tour of visitation to Cochin-China, as his secretary and confessor. The bishop arrived at Macao in 1738 and was detained and made a captive there, at the instigation of Portuguese Jesuits who resented an investigation of their intrigues against the French missionaries. In Mar., 1739, the bishop was able to continue his journey and after two months landed in Cochin-China. He admonished the missionaries to forget their quarrels and restore harmony. Complaints were brought against the Portuguese Jesuits who had excommunicated many on the pretense of Jansenism, and when the bishop opposed the Jesuits, he was accused of Jansenism himself and of disturbing the public peace. Letters from Rome, addressed to him, were intercepted and never reached him. As he saw that peace was impossible, he divided the provinces between the Jesuits, the French missionaries, and the Franciscans; but sorrow and ill treatment (or poison) caused his death in 1741. Favre took his place, and not being able to prevail against the Jesuits, went to Rome to give an account of his visitation. Thence he returned to his native country where he published in 1746 his *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses sur la visite apostolique de M. de la Baume à la Cochinchine en l'année 1740*, giving a report of Jesuit misdemeanors and intrigues. The book was condemned by the bishop of Lausanne and publicly burned at Freiburg, and the Jesuits bought up every copy they could. (J. Pfotenhauer.)

Bibliography: M. Mülbauer, *Katholische Missionen in Ostindien*, pp. 171 sqq., 262 sqq., Freiburg, 1852; G. Warneck, *Protestantische Beleuchtung der römischen Angriffe auf die evangelische Heidenmission*, pp. 388 sqq., Gütersloh, 1884–85.

FAWCETT, JOHN: English Baptist; b. at Lidget Green, near Bradford (10 m. w. of Leeds), Yorkshire, Jan. 6, 1740; d. at Brearley Hall, near Wainsgate (14 m. s.w. of Leeds), July 25, 1817 Converted under George Whitefield's preaching at sixteen, he joined the Baptist Church at Bradford in 1759, and in 1764 entered the Baptist ministry. He settled in the parish of Halifax and remained there till the end of his life, preaching first at Wainsgate, then at Hebden Bridge, where a new church was built for him in 1777. In 1772 he declined a call to London as the successor of Dr. John Gill (q.v.), and in 1793 the presidency of the Baptist Academy at Bristol. In addition to his work as a pastor and author, he conducted an academy at Brearley Hall, and also, for a short time, an institution for the training of Baptist ministers. Of his *Hymns* (Leeds, 1782), numbering 166, the best known are, "How precious is the Book divine," "Thus far my God hath led me on," and "Blest be the tie that binds." He also published a number of works on practical religion, including, *Advice to Youth* (Leeds, 1786); and *An Essay on Anger* (1787); also *The Royal Devotional Family Bible* (2 vols., London, 1811).

Bibliography: J. Fawcett, *The Life, Ministry, and Writings of . John Fawcett*, London, 1818 (by his son); *DNB*, xviii. 257–258; S. W. Duffie d, *English Hymns*, pp 73–74, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 373.

FEAST OF THE ASS. See Ass, Feast of the.

FEAST OF FOOLS. See Fools, Feast of.

FEASTS AND FESTIVALS.

I. Hebrew.
Terms and Underlying Principles (§ 1).
Provisions of the Priest Code (§ 2).
Comparison of Other Codes (§ 3).
Order of Development of the Codes (§ 4).
Changes in Character of Festivals (§ 5).
II. Christian.
Sunday and Sabbath (§ 1).
Annual Feasts (§ 2).
The Protestant Churches (§ 3).

I. Hebrew: To express the idea of religious festival, the Hebrew has two words, *mo'edh* and *ḥagh* (Ar. *ḥajj*). *Mo'edh* denotes a set time for coming together, and can be employed for any festival (Ezek. xlv. 17) except Sabbaths and new moons (II Chron. viii. 13; cf. Isa. i. 14). *Ḥagh* means particularly a festal dance, comes to mean festival in general, and is then applied to the three great feasts at which pilgrimage was made to the great sanctuary, and particularly to the feast of booths (tabernacles) in autumn. No single principle determines the character of feasts in the Old Testament. The feast of new moon and perhaps the Sabbath are lunar, and upon the sabbath reckoning in larger cycles depend the Sabbatical and jubilee years. The feasts of unleavened bread, of weeks and of tabernacles are determined by the season, at least on their agrarian side. The Passover is a historical-religious commemoration, into connection with which the feasts of unleavened bread and of booths are brought, and in post-Biblical times Pentecost was brought into this circle. The same is true of Purim and the feast of dedication. The day of atonement is purely religious with no fast ties to any special date. The festivals can be considered also in their relations to the family, to sanctuaries, to communities or to the central sanctuary.

1. Terms and Underlying Principles.

For a historical review of the festal system the priestly document furnishes the basis, since it is the most developed. The classical passages are Lev. xxiii.; for the Passover Ex. xii. 3–20, 43–50; for the Sabbatical and jubilee years Lev. xxv.; the institution of the offerings is in Num. xxviii.–xxix. The result of these enactments is as follows: Through the twofold daily offering each day becomes a religious festival and to this daily offering the special offerings of particular occasions are additions (Num. xxviii. 3 sqq.). The Sabbath (q.v.) is a day consecrated to God with absolute rest, convocation at the sanctuary, and special offerings (Num. xxviii. 9). The Passover is a house festival celebrated on the fourteenth day of the first month in commemoration of the immunity of the Israelites in the final Egyptian plague; the paschal lamb is eaten with unleavened bread and its blood is sprinkled on the door-posts. The feast of unleavened bread begins on the fifteenth day of the first month and continues seven days; during the whole period special offerings are made, and the first and last days are rest days with special convocations. Ex. xii. 17 brings it into connection with the Exodus, Lev.

2. Provisions of the Priest Code.

xxiii. 9–14 connects with it the feast of first-fruits, after which the new harvest might be enjoyed. Pentecost or the feast of weeks depends upon this, occurring seven weeks later, celebrated as a rest day and time of special offerings and convocation. The feast of tabernacles begins on the fifteenth day of the seventh month and continues eight days, the first and last of which are days of convocation, each day having its special offering. While this feast commemorates the sojourn in the wilderness, Lev. xxiii. 39 brings it into connection with the harvest. The new moons are celebrated with special offerings (Num. xxviii. 11–15); the new moon of the seventh month is a rest day with convocation, blowing of the trumpet, and special offerings. The Day of Atonement, occurring on the tenth day of the seventh month, is an absolute rest day with convocation and its own ritual of offerings, a penitential festival with fasting and high-priestly atonement for sin and impurity. The Sabbatical year occurs once in seven years, the land is not cultivated, and the products are common property. The jubilee year falls at the end of a cycle of seven Sabbatical years, therefore every fiftieth year. It begins on the day of atonement with the blowing of trumpets, involves a complete rest of the land, and the people recover their earlier possessions and Hebrew slaves their freedom. The basis of this is the idea that the land is Yahweh's, while his people are his guests, his servants, and therefore not man's servants. The religious interest is dominant throughout. Passover, unleavened bread, and the feast of tabernacles are commemorative. Especially closely connected with religious ideas are the day of atonement, and the Sabbatical and the jubilee year. All, with the exception of the Passover, are celebrated with convocations at the sanctuary with collective offerings, among which offerings for sin are constant excepting at the daily and Sabbath sacrifice. The times are fixed by the months, yet the feasts of unleavened bread, of Pentecost, and of booths are related to the seasons and to agriculture.

Ezekiel (xlv. 17–xlvi. 15) omits Pentecost, and locates the Passover on the fourteenth day of the first month, with a seven days' use of unleavened bread, with daily sacrifice of burnt offerings, food-offerings, and sin-offerings. And he places the feast of tabernacles on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, continuing seven days with special offerings. On the days of new moon and Sabbath, offerings are required, and a daily morning offering consisting of burnt offering and food-offering. On the first day of the first and of the seventh month the sanctuary is to be cleansed by the blood of a sin-offering. Thus Ezekiel is close to the Priest Code, though the prince makes the offerings in the name of the people, the feasts are fewer, atonement day appears to be semiyearly, and the household Passover is not mentioned.

3. Comparison of Other Codes. The Deuteronomic passage is xvi. 1–17, and deals with three great festivals at the central sanctuary. In the month of Abib occurs the Passover, not a celebration at home, but at the central sanctuary and for a single day, though unleavened bread is to be eaten for seven days in memory of the hurried flight from Egypt. Pentecost is celebrated seven weeks after the commencement of harvest at the central sanctuary with enjoyment of the gifts brought. The feast of tabernacles is loosely placed at the close of the harvest and vintage and is also celebrated at the central sanctuary. Thus Deuteronomy differs from the Priest Code and Ezekiel in not fixing exactly the time of celebration, the accompaniment of sin-offering is lacking, and the offerings are not those of the community as a whole, but are enjoyed as festal meals. The Sabbath celebration is provided for in the Deuteronomic decalogue, and the basis is humanitarian. There is no Sabbatical or jubilee year, though a release of Hebrew debtors and slaves takes place. The festival of new moon does not appear, still less the day of atonement or the double temple cleansing of Ezekiel. The exposition of the Yahwistic Code is complicated by Deuteronomic redaction of the passages which deal with the festivals (Ex. xxiii. 10–17, xxxiv. 18–26; cf. xii. 34, 39, xiii. sqq.). As they stand these passages involve a seven days' festival of unleavened bread in Abib (commemorative), a harvest festival (of first-fruits), and a feast of ingathering at the close of the year. The Sabbath has the same humanitarian basis as in Deuteronomy, and the products of the land in the seventh year are common property. Ex. xxxiv mentions again these same three festivals, but the feast of weeks bears the same name as in Deuteronomy, and verses 25, 19–20 indicate that the Passover did not originate with Deuteronomy.

This review shows that the Priest Code and the Yahwistic Code stand at the two extremes of the development, with Ezekiel and Deuteronomy coming in between; and, further, it is clear that the order is JE, Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and P. The historical writings confirm this result.

4. Order of Development of the Codes. Thus in Neh. viii. 14 sqq. mention is made of a festival of the Priest Code (feast of booths) of which it is expressly said "since the days of Joshua had not the children of Israel done so." In II Kings xxiii. 21–23, is found another note of similar character, related to the celebration at the central sanctuary. The prophetical writings are in connection with the Yahwistic Code, and earlier history also accords with this. A sacrificial feast in the city of Samuel is mentioned in I Sam. ix. 12 sqq., and a family festival and sacrifice in Bethlehem in I Sam. xx. 6. There are pilgrimages also to sanctuaries where a festal meal is eaten (I Sam. i. 3 sqq.; cf. Hos. ix. 4–5). Mention occurs often of an ancient festival (Judges xxi. 19; I Kings viii. 2), while a festival of the northern kingdom is placed in the eighth month (I Kings xii. 32) which is probably the retention or reinstitution of an old custom, and has relation to the feast of booths. Frequent mention occurs of the Sabbath and the new moon, though the latter was not legislated for in the earliest codes. I Sam. xxv. 2 sqq. and II Sam. xiii. 23 mention a festival of sheep-shearing, the characteristic of which was a somewhat exuberant joy. The ethical character of the religion of Israel per-

haps led to the exclusion of this festival from the national observances.

Detailed examination leads to the conclusion that festivals of an agricultural character became religious observances, and at the same time the earlier character of family or local celebration changed and took a national form. The separation from the natural circumstances of their celebration is marked by exact determination of dates, while new occasions of purely religious significance came in, such as the two purifications of Ezekiel and the day of atonement.

5. Changes in Character of Festivals.

Deuteronomy is the turning-point, where the festivals still have as a motive rejoicing before Yahweh (xiv. 26, xvi. 11); but the first step toward the separation of the festivals from the environment of nature amid which they arose and the determination of a religious purpose was taken in the centralization of the cultus. Only in the case of the Passover the Priest Code breaks with Deuteronomy and Ezekiel and makes the celebration a home affair, and the lamb loses its sacrificial character. The festal character of these celebrations was not wholly lost under the Priest Code, as is shown by the feast of booths; and Lev. xxiii. still retains recollection of the connection of the three principal feasts with agriculture. The question whether these three, the feasts of unleavened bread, Pentecost and tabernacles, were instituted prophetically by Moses or arose among the Hebrews by adoption from the Canaanites has been variously answered. But Judges ix. 27 gives an account of a festival analogous to the feast of booths. No ground exists, however, for deriving from that source the celebration of the Sabbath (cf. Amos viii. 5). On the other hand the assertion that a Sabbath rest could not originate among a pastoral people is contradicted by facts from the life of the Arabs. The new moon festival probably arose under nomadic conditions, in spite of the silence of the earliest legislation. That the sheep-shearing festival was pre-Mosaic is clear from Gen. xxxviii. 13, and that the Passover had pre-Mosaic antecedents is shown by Ex. iii. 18, v. 3, viii. 21 sqq., etc. Just what its character was in its earliest form is not clear, except that the connection with the first-born which it always had suggests that it was the occasion of presenting the first-fruits to deity. An Arabic festival of the same purport existed.

Besides the festivals already mentioned, two arose in later times. One of these is Purim, the origin of which Esther purports to give, called in II Macc xv. 36 the Day of Mordecai. In Maccabean times arose the feast of the dedication of the temple, beginning on the eighth of Kislew, celebrating the purification of the temple after its defilement by Antiochus Epiphanes (I Macc. iv. 59; II Macc. x. 7, and doubtless the title of Ps. 30). See the articles on the different festivals; also SYNAGOGUE.

(F. BUHL.)

II. Christian: The primitive Church apparently knew no special feast-days at the first. With the abrogation of the Mosaic law, its feasts also ceased, and it passed for perverted Judaizing legality to retain them (cf. Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 9–11; Col. ii. 16). The original theory was that for a redeemed Christian every day was a feast-day. At the same time, the need of common devotional festivals in which all could take part led to the practise of keeping these on the day of the week which from the beginning enjoyed a certain distinction as that of the Lord's resurrection (see SUNDAY; cf. Acts xx. 7; I Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10; Epistle of Barnabas xv. 9; Ignatius, *Ad Magnesios*, ix. 1; Justin, I *Apol.*, lxvii.). The Sabbath too was observed to some extent, especially in the East and among the Jewish Christians. Yet it was secondary to Sunday; only the Apostolic Constitutions demand the like solemnity for both. In the Roman Church, fasting was observed on the Sabbath; but Gregory the Great declared the prohibition of labor on the Sabbath to be the work of Antichrist—a decision which later contributed a cause for ecclesiastical separation of East and West. The early Church also came to observe Wednesdays and Fridays as days of prayer and partial fasting in commemoration of the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus (see FASTING, II.).

1. Sunday and Sabbath.

There were also annually recurring feasts in the earliest time. Probably the paschal feast (see EASTER) was always celebrated in some way, preeminently by the Jewish Christians in connection with their former celebration of the Passover, for memorial of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. It was succeeded by a fifty-day season of rejoicing, from which afterward Ascension and Pentecost (qq.v.) grew forth with peculiar solemnity, and was preceded by a season of mourning, attended with fasting of varying length and observance. The institution of these festal celebrations was held to be an affair of ecclesiastical ordering, and often required special justification in the light of New Testament liberty. The first Christian festival which had no connection with feasts of Israel is that of the Epiphany (q.v.). It was fixed on a definite day of the year (Jan. 6) and is thus an "immovable feast," unlike Easter and the festivals dependent on it, which vary from year to year (see CHURCH YEAR; EASTER), and hence are known as "movable feasts." The Epiphany was originally the festival of Christ's baptism. The nativity festival (see CHRISTMAS) first occurs in the West from the middle of the fourth century. In the East, so late as the fifth century, they still celebrated both the birth and baptism of the Lord on Epiphany. In the sixth century, the feast of the circumcision of Christ was introduced as the octave of Nativity; preceding that time, the first of January had been widely observed as a penitential day, with attendant fasting, in order to restrain Christians from the pagan new year festivities (see NEW YEAR FESTIVAL). The Christmas feast was ushered in by a preliminary festal season (see ADVENT), originally of longer duration, but afterward restricted to four weeks; this, too, was a season of penance and fasting in the West (see FASTING, II.).

2. Annual Feasts.

The three principal festivals, Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas, which with their preceding and

following seasons gradually embraced the whole year (see CHURCH YEAR), were supplemented, from time to time, by many minor feasts, many of them introduced only in particular districts, as appears from ancient local calendars (see CALENDAR, THE CHRISTIAN). Only the most important can be mentioned here. The festival of the Trinity (see TRINITY, FESTIVAL OF THE) was not appointed for the Church at large until 1334. The feast of the Blessed Sacrament (*festum corporis Christi*) occurred in the diocese of Liége from 1246, and was generally adopted in 1264 (see CORPUS CHRISTI). Certain festivals of the cross originated in the East, and two of them became current in the West also (see CROSS, EXALTATION OF THE; CROSS, INVENTION OF THE). Among the feasts of Mary, the Annunciation (Mar. 25; see ANNUNCIATION, FEAST OF THE) is no doubt the earliest. This and the festival of the Purification (Feb. 2) were sometimes regarded as feasts of Christ as well; they date from the fifth century (for the Purification and the many other feasts of the Virgin, see MARY, THE MOTHER OF JESUS CHRIST). Apostles, evangelists, and other New Testament characters all came to have their days; and by degrees the practise grew up of observing an annual commemoration of martyrs on the day of their death, and especially at their tombs (see ANNIVERSARIUS). This was extended to confessors, virgins, and other saints, until nearly every day in the year had its liturgical commemoration of some saint, event, doctrine, or sacred object.

3. The Protestant Churches.

The large number of "holy days of obligation" (i.e., in the Roman Catholic system, days which must be kept by attendance at mass and abstinence from unnecessary servile work) observed in the countries of Western Europe in the latter part of the Middle Ages constituted a real economic difficulty, and there were many complaints of it. When the Reformation began, its tendency was to sweep away the far greater number of such observances. Luther was at first inclined to think that Sunday alone should be kept; but in 1528 he and Melanchthon recommended the observance of Christmas, New Year's Day (Circumcision of Christ), Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost, and allowed, as feasts of the second class, those which had Scriptural warrant. German custom often postpones the celebration of secondary feasts to the following Sunday. The Church of England retained the feasts just named and certain others commonly called (from the old rubricated printing of the prayer-book) "red-letter" days, with special services, and kept a number of "black-letter" or minor festivals in the calendar, with no provision for their observance. The American Episcopal Church retained the red-letter days, and even added to them at the last revision the Transfiguration of Christ (Aug. 6), but omitted the black-letter days from the calendar.* In the Reformed churches as a rule all festivals except Sunday were abolished. Since the middle of the last century there has been a tendency to appoint new festivals; e.g., the German Reformation festival (end of October or beginning of November) and so called festival of the dead (on the last Sunday of the church year in memory of all who have died in course of the year), harvest festival, children's day, missionary Sunday, and the like. National memorial days are often celebrated with religious services. The New England fast-day (see FAST-DAY) and Thanksgiving (q.v.) deserve special mention. The custom of celebrating Easter and Christmas with floral decorations, special music, and sermons on the events commemorated is increasing among all non-liturgical churches.

The tendency in the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation has been constantly to add new saints' days and other feasts to the calendar, with liturgical observance, but on the other hand to diminish the number of holy days of obligation; thus in the United States at the present time there are none (outside of Sundays) but the Feast of the Circumcision (Jan. 1), the Ascension, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (Aug. 15), All Saints' Day (Nov. 1), the Immaculate Conception (Dec. 8), and Christmas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: I. J. F. L. George, *Die älteren jüdischen Feste*, Berlin, 1835; H. Ewald, *De feriarum Hebræarum origine et ratione*, Göttingen, 1841; idem, *Alterthümer*, pp. 130 sqq., 151 sqq., 441 sqq., ib. 1866, Eng. transl., pp. 89 sqq., 113 sqq., 334 sqq., Boston, 1876; H. Hupfeld, *De primitiva et vera festorum apud Hebræos ratione*, Halle, 1851–65; F. Bachmann, *Die Festgesetze des Pentateuchs*, Berlin, 1858; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 83–120; A. Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry and Services*, pp. 144–300, London, 1874; B. Stade, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 498–503, Berlin, 1884; W H. Green, *The Hebrew Feasts in their Relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses*, New York, 1885 (anticritical); J. T. de Visser, *Hebreeuwsche Archaeologie*, i. 412 sqq., Utrecht, 1891; J. Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, passim, Edinburgh, 1892; H. Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, i. 359–369 et passim, ii. 87–100, London, 1892; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 388 sqq. et passim; Nowack, *Archäologie*, ii. 138–203; Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 38, 56, 384; idem, *OTJC*, passim; *DB*, i. 859–863; *EB*, ii. 1505 sqq., 1509 sqq.; *JE*, v. 374–378; *KL*, iv. 1436–47.

II. Bingham, *Origines*, book XX., cf. XIII. ix. 6–7; J. C. W. Augusti, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie*, i. 457–595, Leipsic, 1836 (especially useful); R. Nelson, *Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*, reprinted London, 1810; F. Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, iv. 2, pp. 577–614, Leipsic, 1821 (compares Christian cycle of festivals with pre-Christian celebrations); A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. 1, pp. 119 sqq., Mainz, 1829; A. Butler, *Movable Feasts, Fasts . of the Catholic Church*, Dublin, 1839; J. H. Hobart, *Festivals and Feasts*, London, 1887; H. Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Han-

* According to the Anglican prayer-books the feasts to be observed throughout the year are as follows. All Sundays; the Circumcision (Jan. 1); the Epiphany (Jan. 6); the Conversion of St. Paul (Jan. 25); the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (Feb. 2); St. Matthias the Apostle (Feb. 24; in leap-year Feb. 25 in the Roman Catholic Church); the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin (Mar. 25); St. Mark the Evangelist (Apr. 25); St. Philip and St. James the Apostles (May 1); the Ascension; St. Barnabas the Apostle (June 11); the Nativity of St. John Baptist (June 24); St. Peter the Apostle (June 29); St. James the Apostle (July 25); the Transfiguration (Aug. 6; in the American Episcopal Church only); St. Bartholomew the Apostle (Aug. 24); St. Matthew the Apostle (Sept. 21); St. Michael and All Angels (Sept. 29); St. Luke the Evangelist (Oct. 18); St. Simon and St. Jude the Apostles (Oct. 28); All Saints (Nov. 1); St. Andrew the Apostle (Nov. 30); St. Thomas the Apostle (Dec. 21); the Nativity (Dec. 25); St. Stephen the Martyr (Dec. 26); St. John the Evangelist (Dec. 27); the Holy Innocents (Dec. 28); Monday and Tuesday in Easter-week; Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun-week.

over, 1891–98; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, passim, London, 1904; J. G. Greenough, *Christian Festivals*, Manchester, 1908; *DCA*, i. 669–671 and especially ii. 2054–2059, where a list is given; *KL*, iv. 1391–1436; and literature under the articles on the several festivals, also under Common Prayer, Book of; Calendar, the Christian.

FEATHERS' TAVERN ASSOCIATION: A society of English clergy and laymen formed in the later part of the eighteenth century to secure a revision of the English liturgy, named from the fact that the members held their meetings in the Feathers' Tavern in the Strand, London. An agitation for revision, started by John Jones with his anonymous *Free and Candid Disquisitions* (1749), had come to a head with the publication of Francis Blackburne's *The Confessional* (1766). As a corollary from Chillingworth's principle that the Bible is the religion of Protestants, Blackburne argued that Protestant ministers should not be required to subscribe to anything but the word of God. He would abolish subscription, not only to the liturgy and the thirty-nine articles, but to the creeds as well. This work was published anonymously; but in 1771 Blackburne spoke out openly. On July 17 of this year he and his friends held their first meeting at the Feathers' Tavern to consider the drawing of a petition to parliament. The gist of the petition agreed upon, which was an extreme statement of Protestant individualism, was, that the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed be stricken out, and that Protestants be allowed to interpret Scripture for themselves. This petition, opposed in a strong speech by Edmund Burke, was rejected by parliament by a vote of 217 to 71. The petition was signed by Deists, Arians, and Socinians; and of the 250 names it bore Blackburne's was the only one of much importance. Men like Bishop Edmund Law, Dr. Watson, and Dr. Paley, while in sympathy with the movement, declined to commit themselves. In 1773 and 1774 the subject was again brought up in parliament, but without any result. The Feathers' Tavern Association was short-lived and accomplished nothing.

Bibliography: J. A. Baxter, *Church Hist. of England*, p. 668, London, 1849; J. B. Marsden, *Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects*, i. 314, ib. 1856; J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church 1714–1800*, pp. 209–211, 219, 252, ib , 1906.

FEATLEY, DANIEL: English controversialist and royalist; b. at Charlton (7 m. n.n.e. of Oxford), Oxfordshire, Mar. 15, 1582; d. at Chelsea, London, Apr. 17, 1645. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Oxford (B.A., 1601; M.A., 1605), and soon became a power for Protestantism. From 1610 to 1613 he was in Paris as chaplain to Sir Thomas Edmondes, the English ambassador. He was domestic chaplain to George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, and afterward chaplain of Charles I. In 1619 he became rector of Lambeth, and in 1627 of Acton. He was provost of Chelsea College in 1630. During the Civil War his property was plundered, and on two occasions he narrowly escaped assassination. He was a member of the Westminster Assembly and was the last of the Episcopal members to withdraw from that body Soon afterward he was imprisoned, but was released a short time before his death. Among his voluminous works are, *Ancilla pietatis, or the Handmaid to Private Devotion* (2 pts., London, 1626), a favorite book with Charles I., and often reprinted, also in foreign languages; *Mystica Clavis: a Key Opening Divers Difficult and Mysterious Texts of Holy Scripture* (1636); *Roma ruens, Rome's Ruin* (1644), an anti-Catholic work written at the request of parliament while he was in prison; and *The Dippers Dipt* (1645), the result of a controversy with four Baptists at Southwark, Oct. 17, 1642.

Bibliography: The early account of Featley is by John Featley, *Featlæi palingenesia, with a succinct Hist. of his Life and Death* (London), 1660. Consult: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, iii. 47, 58, 78–79, 267–269, 4 vols., London, 1732–38, 5 vols., Bath, 1793–97; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 156–169, 1254, London, 1813–20; *DNB*, xviii. 276–280 (where a full list of literature is given).

FEBRONIUS, JUSTINUS, FEBRONIANISM. See Hontheim, Johann Nicolaus.

FECHT, feHt, **JOHANNES:** German Lutheran, an opponent of Pietism; b. at Sulzberg, in the Breisgau, Dec. 25, 1636; d. at Rostock May 5, 1716. He studied at Durlach and Strasburg, and in 1661 began a wandering student life of five years, visiting a number of German universities and residing for a considerable time at Wittenberg and Giessen. In 1666 he was recalled to Sulzberg, and in 1669 was appointed court chaplain and professor of theology. He was then superintendent in Durlach until the capture of the city by the French in 1689, when he fled to Calw, and met there the duke of Mecklenburg, who invited him to Rostock. He removed to that city in 1690 and remained there as superintendent and professor until his death, enjoying the utmost esteem and refusing flattering calls to other universities. He was a genuine representative of the conservative theology of the seventeenth century, and, despite his later reputation as an impassioned polemist, was at heart a man of peace in the eyes of his contemporaries. His opposition to Pietism was sincere, nor did he fail to respect its good qualities. He was a prolific writer, beginning with philosophy and classics, and later touching every department of theology, although he gradually came to restrict himself to dogmatics and polemics. His principal works are: *Historia coloquii Emmendingensis* (Rostock, 1694); *Selectiorum ex universa theologia controversiarum, recentiorum præcipue, sylloge* (1698); *Philocalia sacra* (1707); and the posthumous *Lectiones theologicæ* (1722) and *Compendium universæ theologiæ* (Zerbst, 1744). (K. Schmidt.)

Bibliography: The "Life" of Fecht, by his son, was reproduced in *Fechtii compendium*, Zerbst, 1740. Consult F. A. G. Tholuck, *Lebenszeugen der lutherischen Kirche aus allen Ständen*, pp. 183 sqq., Berlin, 1859.

FEDERAL THEOLOGY. See Cocceius, Johannes, and his School.

FEINE, fai'ne, **PAUL:** Lutheran; b. at Golmsdorf (5 m. n.e. of Jena) Sept. 9, 1859. He studied in Jena and Berlin and, after teaching in a gymnasium in the former city (1884–86), was private tutor in a noble family until 1889. Then until

1893 he taught in a gymnasium at Göttingen, and in 1893 became privat-docent in the university of the same city. In 1894 he was appointed professor of New Testament exegesis in the Evangelical theological faculty at Vienna and in 1907 accepted a call to Breslau. He has written *Eine vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas im Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte* (Gotha, 1891); *Der Jakobusbrief* (Eisenach, 1893); *Das gesetzesfreie Evangelium des Paulus* (Leipsic, 1898); *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (1902); *Die Erneuerung des paulinischen Christentums durch Luther* (1903); *Der Römerbrief* (Göttingen, 1903); *Das Christentum Jesu und das Christentum der Apostel in ihrer Abgrenzung gegen die Religionsgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1904); and *Paulus als Theologe* (Berlin, 1906).

FELGENHAUER, fel'gen-hau"er, **PAUL:** Theosophist and pantheistic mystic; b. at Putschwitz (district of Podersam, 45 m. w.n.w. of Prague), Bohemia, Nov. 16, 1593, old style; d. not before 1660. His father was a Lutheran minister of Putschwitz. He studied theology at Wittenberg and became deacon there in the Schlosskirche. Being obliged to leave Wittenberg soon afterward, he returned to Bohemia and circulated his remarkable views in writings, affirming in his *Chronologie* (1620) that the world was created 4,234 years before the birth of Christ, and that the end was immediately at hand. Persecutions of the Protestants compelled him to leave Bohemia. He was at Amsterdam in 1623, then is found in the vicinity of Bremen, again in Holland, and lastly at Hamburg as late as 1660. His manifold chiliastic and mystical tracts, wherein he described the existing Church as an obdurate Babel, were eagerly read by people of the lower classes. Theologians more than once attacked his doctrines, particularly Georg Rost, court preacher of Güstrow, and the clergy of Hamburg, Bremen, Lübeck, and Lüneburg. He was imprisoned for a time by the authorities of Celle and Hanover. It is not known when or where he died. A partial list of his numerous writings is in Adelung, pp. 400 sqq. CARL BERTHEAU.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. H. Starke, *Lubeca lutherano-evangelica*, Hamburg, 1724; G. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, ii. 373 sqq., Schaffhausen, 1741; [J. C. Adelung,] *Geschichte der menschlichen Narrheit*, iv. 388–407, Leipsic, 1787; *ADB*, viii. 278–279.

FELICISSIMUS. See CYPRIAN, § 2.

FELIX: The name of four popes and one antipope, who is sometimes counted as a fifth pope.

Felix I.: Pope 269–274. He succeeded Dionysius, becoming pope on Jan. 5, 269. The only positive fact known of his pontificate is the statement of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., xxx. 19; cf. 23) that in the controversy in Antioch instigated by Paul of Samosata (see MONARCHIANISM, III.) the Emperor Aurelian decided that the church building should be given to " those to whom the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome should adjudge it." From this it is probable that Felix exchanged *litteræ communicationis* with Domnus of Antioch, and that he expressed his opposition to Paul of Samosata at greater length in a letter to Maximus of Alexandria. The latter document was tampered with in an Apollinarian sense at the end of the fourth century, and in this shape was considered by the Council of Ephesus (431). According to the *Depositio episcoporum* (354) Felix died a natural death, and was buried in the catacomb of St. Calixtus, Dec. 30, 274. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Catalogus Liberianus*, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, ix (1891), 75; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 158, Paris, 1886; idem, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 37; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 23; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche bis Leo I.*, pp. 365–369, Bonn, 1881; *DCB*, ii. 479–480.

Felix II.: Pope 355–358. When Liberius (q.v.) was banished at the end of 355 by the Emperor Constantius, whose policy he had opposed, the Roman clergy took an oath not to recognize another bishop as long as Liberius lived; but the oath was soon forgotten, and the Archdeacon Felix was persuaded to become bishop. He was consecrated by three Arian bishops, including Acacius of Cæsarea, in the imperial palace, and, though not an Arian himself, he supported the policy of external union favored by Constantius and held communion with the Arians. The majority of the Roman clergy were won over by imperial favors to support Felix, but the people remained true to Liberius and refused allegiance to the former. Constantius on coming to Rome, Apr. 28, 357, found so much discord that he expressed his willingness to restore Liberius, after he had agreed to sign the third Sirmian formula of the summer of 358 and to rule jointly with Felix. But on the approach of Liberius to the city, Felix was driven out, and, after unsuccessful attempts to regain his position, died at Porto Nov. 20, 365. From the sixth century on a curiously inaccurate legend grew up about his name which made him a venerated saint and martyr. The oldest evidences for this are the *Liber pontificalis*, the *Acta Felicis*, and the *Acta Eusebii*. Döllinger thinks this the result of a confusion with an African bishop and martyr of the same name, whose remains were translated to the same spot on the Via Aurelia where later the church named after Pope Felix was erected. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: Faustinus and Marcellinus, *Libellus precum ad imperatores*, in *MPL*, xiii. 81; Athanasius, *Arian History*, chap. 75, in *NPNF* 2 ser., iv. 298; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 37, in *NPNF*, 2 ser., ii. 61–65; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 11 sqq., in *NPNF*, 2 ser., ii. 306 sqq.; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 13, in *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 77–79; Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, chap. xcviii.; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 211, Paris, 1886; idem, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 80–81. Consult: J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche bis Leo I.*, pp. 471 sqq., Bonn, 1881; *DCB*, ii. 480–482; Bower, *Popes*, i. 37; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 104–105. On the Felix fable consult the *Acta Felicis*, ed. E. Baluze, *Miscellanea*, i. 33 sqq., Paris, 1761; J. J. I. Döllinger, *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, pp. 126–145, Munich, 1863, Eng. transl., *Fables*, pp. 183–209, New York, 1872.

Felix III.: Pope 483–492. He was the son of a Roman presbyter of the same name, and was probably attached as a deacon to the Church of St. Paul when, in the beginning of Mar., 483, with the assent of Odoacer, he was chosen pope. Apparently he had been married before this and had several children, from one of whom Gregory the Great was descended. His principal importance

as pope was the stand which he made against the Monophysite policy of the Emperor Zeno, from whom Felix, writing to announce his election, demanded the deposition of Peter Mongus, the moderate Monophysite set up by the emperor as patriarch of Alexandria (see MONOPHYSITES, §§ 5 sqq.). He wrote at the same time to Acacius, boldly summoning him to appear for judgment in Rome, and declaring in favor of the Council of Chalcedon. Zeno threw the Roman legates into prison, and Acacius worked on them until they agreed to hold communion with the representatives of Peter Mongus. When Felix heard of this, he deposed both them and Acacius (July, 484). There was a thorough breach between East and West, and in the former Felix's name was stricken from the diptychs. But the Easterns repented their hasty action. Before 489 some of them had opened negotiations with Felix, and, after the death of Acacius, Zeno agreed to the elevation of an orthodox prelate of the name of Flavitas to the patriarchal throne, and the notification of his election to Felix. The pope assumed an attitude of reserve, and even after the accession of a new emperor, Anastasius, he was still obliged to maintain a firm position, requiring the restoration of the decrees of Chalcedon to their rightful position, the deposition of the opponents of Rome, and the erasure of the names of Acacius and Peter from the diptychs. With equal energy he took up the cause of the persecuted orthodox Christians in the Vandal kingdom, and showed himself in every way a worthy successor of Leo the Great. He died at the end of Feb., 492, and is commemorated as a saint on Feb. 25.

(H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 92 sqq., Paris, 1886; idem, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 114–115; Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 14 sqq.; Victor Tonnennesis, *Chronica*, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, xi (1893), 190–191. Consult: R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 15–16, Elberfeld, 1868; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche, . . bis Nikolaus I.*, pp. 140 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 271–282; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 328–331; *DCB*, ii. 482–485.

Felix IV.: Pope 526–530. He was a Samnite, the son of Castorius, elected under the influence of Theodoric after John I. had died in prison, and was consecrated July 12, 526. After Theodoric's death on Aug. 26 or 30, discontent with his high-handed methods broke out, and the senate sent an embassy to Ravenna to ascertain the attitude of the new ruler, Athalaric, toward Felix. Athalaric, however, declared in Felix's favor, and he remained in unquestioned occupation of his see until his death, the exact date of which is contested His pontificate is important only for the part which he took in the Semi-Pelagian controversy, by approving the treatise of Cæsarius of Arles on grace and free will, and sending at the same time to the bishops of Southern Gaul the celebrated *capitula* which were promulgated as canons by the Synod of Orange, July 3, 529 (see CÆSARIUS OF ARLES; SEMI-PELAGIANISM).

(H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 106, 279–280, Paris, 1886; idem, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.* i (1898), 138; Cassiodorus, *Variæ viii. epistolæ*, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, xii (1894), 246; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 30, Elberfeld, 1868; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 300 sqq., Bonn, 1885; Bower, *Popes*, i. 327–331; *DCB*, iv. 485–486.

Felix V. (Duke Amadeus of Savoy): Antipope (or pope) Jan. 5, 1440–Apr. 7, 1449. He was born Dec. 4, 1383, and as ruler in Savoy and the county of Geneva proved himself mild and successful, and won a reputation for piety. He abdicated in 1434 and retired to Ripaille, on Lake Geneva, where he lived in retirement with a few friends. His wife (Maria of Burgundy) was already dead. He was elected pope by the Council of Basel, Nov. 5, 1439, after it had deposed Eugenius IV. (see BASEL, COUNCIL OF). Although he had neither a theological nor a canonical education and must now for the first time study Latin, Amadeus accepted, called himself Felix V., and selected a curia which consisted mostly of Frenchmen. The majority of those whom he tried to make cardinals declined. When, on July 24, 1440, he was consecrated bishop by the cardinal of Arles and was afterward crowned with the tiara, for want of cardinals his two sons ministered at the mass. No country promised allegiance to him. Without ecclesiastical state and without income he resided at Lausanne and Geneva. No improvement in his position followed the death of Eugenius IV. (1449), and Germany acknowledged as the latter's successor Nicholas V. In 1449 Felix voluntarily resigned the pontificate and advised his followers to acknowledge Nicholas V. as pope. For this he received the title of Cardinal of Santa Sabina, the dignity of papal vicar-general of all estates of the house of Savoy, the dioceses of Basel, Strasburg, etc. He again retired to Ripaille and died at Geneva Jan. 7, 1451, regarded as a worthy old man.

PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Voigt, *Pius II.*, vol. i., Berlin, 1856; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 229–237; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, viii. 58–102; Creighton, *Papacy*, iii. 22–111; Pastor, *Popes*, i. 328–330 et passim.

FELIX, SAINT: First bishop of the East Angles; d. 647. He was a Burgundian who came to England inspired by missionary zeal, and was sent by Honorius, archbishop of Canterbury, to East Anglia. The foothold of Christianity in the land was then very slight, but a Christian king, Sigbert, came to the throne about the time of Felix's arrival, and the two together soon accomplished the conversion of the people. Felix was consecrated bishop by Honorius in 631 and fixed his seat at Dunwich, a town on the Suffolk coast, long since washed away by the sea. He obtained teachers from Canterbury for a school founded by Sigbert, and, with the help of an Irish monk, Fursa (q.v.), introduced monastic life. Under Fursa's influence Sigbert resigned his throne and retired to a cell. Felix's day is Mar. 8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The one source is Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 15, iii. 18, 20. Consult A. Jessopp, in the Diocesan Histories, *Norwich*, London, 1884; and Dr. Stubbs, in *DCB*, ii. 489–490.

FELIX AND FESTUS: Two Roman governors of Judea. According to the Book of Acts (xxiv. 10) the former had been ruling for many years at the time of the imprisonment of Paul in 58 or 59.

He was the husband of a Jewess by the name of Drusilla, and two years later was succeeded as procurator by Porcius Festus (Acts xxiv. 24, 27). Both Josephus (*Ant.* XX., vii. 1–2) and Tacitus (*Hist.*, v. 9) state that Drusilla was the wife of Felix, the former making her a sister of Agrippa II. and the latter a granddaughter of Antony and Cleopatra, while according to Suetonius (*Claudius*, xxviii.), Felix was " the husband of three queens." Josephus (*Ant.* XX., viii. 5) states that Felix was sent to Judea as procurator by Claudius at the request of the high priest Jonathan after the deposition of Ventidius Cumanus in 52 or 53. Tacitus (*Annales*, xii. 54), on the other hand, dates his appointment much earlier, asserting that he was procurator of a portion of the province of Samaria together with Cumanus, and that he first gained entire control of Judea after the deposition of Cumanus by Quadratus. Whatever be the reconciliation of the conflicting accounts of the classic writers, the statement in Acts remains unimpugned. It is clear from other sources that Felix was the brother of the imperial favorite Pallas, and that he was a freedman, apparently of Antonia, the mother of Claudius. According to Schürer, Felix seems to have been recalled in 60, while Festus died two years later; Harnack dates the former event in Oct. 55 or 56.

In the case of the Jewish persecution of Paul, Felix received the prisoner with a letter of the tribune stating that the charge was concerned solely with differences of religious opinions among the Jews (Acts xxii. 25–30). This was fully confirmed by the trial before Felix (Acts xxiv. 1–21), but Felix deferred decision on a frivolous pretext (verses 22–23). Paul was accordingly imprisoned, and when Felix retired from office two years later, he left the apostle still in confinement. Festus resumed the case (Acts xxv. 1–12) and, despite the absence of all proof of the prisoner's guilt, threatened to deliver him to the Jews, whereupon Paul saw himself obliged to appeal to the emperor. The motive of both procurators seems to have been the desire to curry favor with the Jews, Felix showing himself to be a common man of little character and Festus being represented as a frivolous cynic. The former, influenced by his Jewish wife, listened to a presentation of the Christian faith by Paul. Touched in conscience by the apostle's words, he devised a pretext to rid himself of his unflattering monitor, yet sought to induce his prisoner to offer bribes for release (Acts xxiv. 24–25). Festus, on the other hand, cynically distorted the facts of the case in conversation with Agrippa (Acts xxv. 13–21), and, humoring the king's curiosity, turned the trial into a farce for the amusement of his guests (verses 22–27), declaring the apostle a madman (Acts xxvi. 24).

In the "War" (II., xii. 8–xiii. 7) Josephus mentions merely the energetic opposition of Felix to revolutionary movements in Judea, but in the "Antiquities" (XX., vii. 1–viii. 8), he makes no attempt to disguise the fact that in the suppression of the " robbers " Felix had not only been merciless in his cruelty, but had stooped to perfidy and assassination, thus preparing the way for the outbreak of the Sicarii. Although his attitude in opposition to the " prophets " and the rebellious Jews of Cæsarea was irreproachable, it is evident that his administration was both immoral and illegal, so that after his retirement to Rome accusations were brought against him by the Jews, which were averted only by the intercession of his powerful brother. The unfavorable characterization of this procurator given by Josephus is confirmed by Tacitus (l.c.).

The statements of Josephus regarding Festus (*Ant.* XX., viii. 9–ix. 1; *War*, II., xiv. 1) are far more scanty, being confined to a recognition of his reckless energy against the rebellious Jews and to an agreement made by him with the Jewish king in opposition to the religious interests of the people. It is evident that the account of Luke regarding both Felix and Festus rests on personal knowledge and deep insight into their history, relations, and personalities. See GOVERNOR. (K. SCHMIDT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best discussion and exposition is Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 571–582, 590, Eng. transl., I. ii. 174–187, 196, where further literature is given. Consult also: W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 306 sqq., New York, 1896; O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1906; and the works on the life of the Apostle Paul.

FELIX AND REGULA: Martyrs, known as the patron saints of Zurich. According to the legend, they came to the neighborhood of Zurich on the advice of St. Maurice, and were persecuted by the emperor Maximian; after suffering frightful tortures, but encouraged to endure by a voice from the clouds, they were beheaded, and then carried their heads in their hands to the place where their bodies were to lie. This legend probably does not antedate the oldest manuscript in which it is given, of the early years of the ninth century, during which a foundation of canons grew up in connection with the church dedicated to the martyrs.

(EMIL EGLI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The anonymous *Passio* is in *ASB*, Sept., iii. 763–774. Consult: Furrer, in *Theologische Zeitschrift der Schweiz*, vi. 1889; G. Heer, *Die Zürcher-Heiligen St. Felix und Regula*, Zurich, 1889. The legend is ed. by A. Lütolf, *Die Glaubensboten der Schweiz vor St. Gallus*, Lucerne, 1871; cf. Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1893), 272.

FELIX OF URGEL. See ADOPTIONISM.

FELL, JOHN: Dean of Christ Church and bishop of Oxford; b. at Longworth (9 m. w.s.w. of Oxford), Berkshire, June 23, 1625; d. at Oxford July 10, 1686. He was educated at Christ Church (M.A., 1643), and was an enthusiastic Royalist, being ejected from his studentship in 1648, the year after his ordination. At the Restoration he was made canon of Christ Church, in place of the ejected Ralph Button. He became dean four months later (Nov. 30, 1660), and also chaplain to the king. As dean of Christ Church, Fell was active in restoring the ritual banished by the Puritans and in rebuilding portions of his college. He was vice-chancellor of Oxford in 1666–69, and in 1675 was consecrated bishop of Oxford. Despite his multifarious duties, Fell was a prolific author and editor. Special mention may be made of his *Interest of England Stated* (London, 1659); *Grammatica rationis, sive institutiones logicæ* (Oxford,

1673); and *The Vanity of Scoffing* (London, 1674). His chief editions are those of Aratus and Eratosthenes (Oxford, 1672) and Cyprian (1682).

Bibliography: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iv. 193, London, 1820; *Burnet's History of My Own Time, Supplement*, edited by Miss H. C. Foxcroft, pp. 47, 214, 464, 509 note, Oxford, 1902; *DNB*, xviii. 293–295.

FELLER, FRANÇOIS XAVIER DE: Belgian Jesuit; b. at Brussels Aug. 18, 1735; d. at Regensburg, Bavaria, May 23, 1802. He entered the order of Jesuits in 1754 and later held professorships at Luxemburg, Liége, and Tyrnau, Hungary, whither he had gone on the expulsion of the Jesuits from France. In 1771 he returned to Belgium, residing in Liége and Luxemburg. In 1794 he removed to Paderborn, and in 1796 to Regensburg. His works, including the *Journal de Luxembourg* (70 vols., 1774–94) of which the wrote the greater part, number some 120 volumes. The works by which he is best known appeared under the name Flexier de Réval, probably an anagram. They are, *Catéchisme philosophique* (Liége, 1773); *Dictionnaire historique et littéraire* (8 vols., 1781; frequently reprinted, with additions, under the title, *Biographie universelle* (new ed., 8 vols., Lyons, 1860); and *Coup d'œil sur le congrès d'Ems* (2 vols., Düsseldorf, 1789).

Bibliography: *Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Mr. l'Abbé de Feller*, Liége, 1802; *KL*, iv. 1322–23; C. A. Baader, *Lexicon . baierischer Schriftsteller*, 4 vols., Augsburg, 1824–25.

FELLTHAM, OWEN: English author; b. at Mutford, Suffolk, c. 1602; d. at Great Billing (3 m. e.n.e. of Northampton), Northamptonshire, 1668. He was probably chaplain to the family of the Earl of Thomond, at Great Billing, and is known chiefly by his *Resolves, Divine, Moral, Political* (London, 1620?), a collection of 100 short essays. This work, subsequently greatly augmented, passed through numerous editions.

Bibliography: An extended notice will be found in *DNB*, xviii. 303–304.

FELTEN, PETER JOSEPH: German Roman Catholic; b. at Düren (18 m. e. of Aachen) Feb. 9, 1851. He studied in Bonn, Münster, Würzburg (D.D., 1876), and Louvain. He was ordained priest in 1874, was professor of St. Cuthbert's College, Durham, England, 1877–86, curate at Süchteln, 1886–88, associate professor of New-Testament exegesis at the University of Bonn 1888–92, full professor since 1892. He has written *Papst Gregor der Neunte* (Freiburg, 1886); *Robert Grosseteste, Bischof von Lincoln* (1887); *Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt* (1892); and *Die Gründung und Tätigkeit des Vereins vom Heiligen Karl Borromæus* (Bonn, 1895).

FELTON, HENRY: English clergyman; b. in the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, Feb. 3, 1679; d. at Barwick-in-Elmet, near Leeds, Yorkshire, Mar. 1, 1740. He was educated at Westminster school, Charterhouse, and Saint Edmund Hall, Oxford M.A., 1702; B.D., 1709; D.D., 1712), of which he was made principal in 1722. On his admission to priest's orders in 1704 he left the university to preach in and about London. During 1708–09 he was pastor of the English Church in Amsterdam. On his return he became domestic chaplain to the duke of Rutland, retaining this office under three successive dukes. In 1711 he was presented to the rectory of Whitwell, Derbyshire, and in 1736 to that of Barwick-in-Elmet, Yorkshire. He was an eminent preacher and his tracts and sermons received considerable attention. His principal works are, *A Dissertation on Reading the Classics* (London, 1711; 4th ed., 1757), very popular in its day; *The Resurrection of the Same Numerical Body and its Reunion to the Same Soul* (Oxford, 1725), an Easter sermon preached at Oxford to refute Locke's idea of personality and identity; *The Christian Faith Asserted against Deists, Arians, and Socinians* (Oxford, 1732), Lady Moyer lectures delivered at St. Paul's in 1728–29, forming his greatest work; and *Sermons on the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man* (London, 1748), published, with a sketch of Felton, by his son.

Bibliography: *DNB*, xviii. 305.

FELTON, JOHN: English Roman Catholic layman (d. 1570). He was born of an old Norfolk family, inherited large means, and lived in the dissolved abbey of Bermondsey, near Southwark, on the Surrey side of the Thames (in present London). He was an ardent Roman Catholic, and his wife had been a maid of honor to Queen Mary. She was a child friend of Queen Elizabeth, and remained on friendly terms with her. When the papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth arrived in England he procured copies from the Spanish ambassador and circulated them. One of them he affixed to the gate of the palace of the bishop of London, then in St. Paul's churchyard, between two and three in the morning of Thursday, May 25th, 1570 (Corpus Christi Day). The bull is dated in Rome Feb. 25th, 1570. In the list of bulls it is called *Regnans in excelsis*, from its opening words. After a brief introduction, in which mention is made of the "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, out of which is no salvation," it asserts that heresy was introduced into England by Henry VIII., purged away by Mary, but reintroduced by Elizabeth. It then specifies Elizabeth's offenses in abolishing the mass and other rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church, permitting heretical books to be circulated, and in depriving the Roman Catholic clergy of their positions and imprisoning many of them. It then goes on to say: "We make it known that Elizabeth, and as many as stand on her side in these matters, have run into the danger of our curse and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. We also make it known that we have deprived her of that right which she pretended to have in the kingdom aforesaid, and also from all and every authority, dignity, and privilege of hers. We declare that all, whosoever by any occasion have taken oath to her, are forever discharged of such oath, and also from all fealty and service which was due to her by reason of her government, and we deprive the said Elizabeth of all legal claim to reign and of the allegiance of the abovesaid. We charge and forbid all and every one of her nobles, subjects and people, and others aforesaid, not to be so hardy as to obey her, or her will

or commandments, upon pain of a similar curse upon them." Then follows the order for the promulgation of the bull. Naturally such a bull was a great offense to all loyal subjects of Elizabeth, and he who had had the hardiness to promulgate it was considered a traitor. The culprit was quickly found out, arrested without opposition the next day, and conveyed to the Tower. On Friday, Aug. 4th, he was condemned at Guildhall on the charge of high treason, and sentenced to death. He remained in Newgate prison till Tuesday, Aug. 8th, when he was drawn on a hurdle to St. Paul's churchyard, hanged on a gallows opposite the bishop of London's palace, beheaded, quartered, and parboiled. He met his fate with courage, and won an honorable place among the Roman Catholic martyrs under Elizabeth. This position was officially established on Dec. 29, 1886, when Pope Leo XIII. proclaimed his beatification.

Bibliography: For his trial see *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, i. 1086–87, London, 1809 sqq. For the text of the bull see Bishop John Jewel's *Works*, ed. for the Parker Society, iv. 1131–32, with Jewel's racy comments and partial translation of the bull in his discourse entitled, *A View of a Seditious Bull Sent into England from Pius Quintus, Bishop of Rome*, the same, pp. 1133–60. For Felton's beatification consult *The Tablet* (London) for Jan. 15th, 1887, pp. 81–82.

FENCING THE TABLES: A Scotch-Presbyterian term for the address made at the table before the administration of the Lord's Supper, because in it the character of those who may and may not partake is described.

FENEBERG, MICHAEL NATHANAEL: Roman Catholic; b. of peasant parents at Oberdorf (37 m. n.w. of Würzburg), Bavaria, Feb. 9, 1751; d. at Vöhringen (40 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Oct. 12, 1812. He was educated by the Jesuits at Augsburg, and joined the order on the advice of his friend the famous Johann Michael Sailer (q.v.). After completing his studies at Ingolstadt and Regensburg, he became teacher at the Regensburg Gymnasium in 1775, then engaged in practical church work in his native village. In 1785 he was appointed professor of rhetoric and poetry in the Augsburg diocesan gymnasium at Dillingen. Being on intimate terms with Sailer, Weber, and Zimmer, who taught at the University of Dillingen, he labored in Sailer's spirit, aiming mainly at true and sincere piety without emphasizing any confessional tendency. Sailer's views awakened the hostility of the Jesuits and their friends, and in 1793 a trial implicating the most prominent teachers of the University was held, at which Feneberg bravely defended his friends. Although the teachers were not condemned, Feneberg left Dillingen and took charge of the parish of Seeg. He held convictions regarding justification which approached rather closely to Evangelical teachings. The tendency of his view shows itself most prominently in the fact that he laid stress on personal communion with God, and especially with Jesus Christ as personal redeemer, with entire elimination of the Church. Feneberg, however, was so little conscious of his opposition to the dogma of the Roman Church that he honestly believed he possessed the old Catholic faith. In 1797 he was subjected to a trial, but was allowed to go back to his old parish. In 1805 he removed to Vöhringen. There he completed a translation of the New Testament (ed. and published by M. Wittmann, afterward bishop of Regensburg, Nuremberg, 1808), which for a long time was much used by German Roman Catholics. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: J. M. Sailer, *Aus Fenebergs Leben* in *Sämmtliche Werke*, vol. xxxix., Sulzbach, 1841; C. von Schmid, *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, 4 vols., Augsburg, 1853–57; V. Thalhofer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Aftermysticismus im Bisthum Augsburg*, pp. 68–69, Regensburg, 1857; *KL*, iv. 1324–27.

FÉNELON, FRANÇOIS DE SALIGNAC DE LA MOTHE.

Early Life (§ 1).
Reputation for Tolerance Unearned (§ 2).
Missionary Labors (§ 3).
Tutorship of Duke of Burgundy (§ 4).
Championship of Mme. Guyon (§ 5).
Conduct of His Diocese (§ 6).
Télémaque (§ 7).
Estimate of His Character (§ 8).

François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon, the French prelate and educator, was born at the castle of Fénelon in Périgord (the modern department of the Dordogne), Aug. 6, 1651; d. at Cambrai Jan. 7, 1715. He was the younger son of the Marquis of Fénelon, and was brought up in an atmosphere of strict piety. Under the guidance of a private tutor he laid the foundation of an excellent knowledge of the classics and after a short stay at the University of Cahors he went to Paris, where he devoted himself to the study of philosophy and theology at the Jesuit *Collège du Plessis*. Made an *abbé* when only fifteen, he achieved distinction by his oratorical gifts; he later entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, where he spent five years in strict retirement, devoted primarily to the study of the Greek Fathers. He became a priest in 1675 and was soon made supervisor of the Nouvelles Converties, an association of women, chiefly of noble rank, whose object was to instruct women newly converted to Roman Catholicism, or those inclined toward conversion, in the principles of the Roman Catholic faith.

1. Early Life.

In his attitude toward Protestants Fénelon does not seem to have earned the epithet of "tolerant" which has been bestowed upon him not only by Roman writers but also by Protestant historians. He was certainly not free from the prejudices of his Church and his time. In his *Dissertation sur la tolérance* he asserts that the Roman Church as opposed to the Protestants can not logically extend toleration to dissidents, and in his sermon *Pour la profession religieuse d'une nouvelle convertie* he characterizes schism as the worst of crimes. Speaking of his old friend Mme. Guyon he says "If it be true that she has attempted to disseminate the damnable teachings of Molinos, they ought to burn her and not admit her to communion, as the Bishop of Meaux has done." Fénelon employed pacific means, nevertheless, in his missionary work, and through his fine oratorical powers, his instructive cate-

2. Reputation for Tolerance Unearned.

chetical addresses, and his eminently gracious personality, he succeeded in winning over large numbers from the Protestant faith; not that he omitted, indeed, to make use of the promise of pensions and other worldly rewards to facilitate conversion. Against obstinacy, moreover, he frequently resorted to force. Certain "stiff-necked" members of the institution directed by him he caused to be imprisoned as criminals of state, and others were punished by incarceration in the loathsome *Hôpital Général*. The results of his ten years' experience as director of the Nouvelles Converties he embodied in his work *De l'éducation des filles* [new ed., Paris, 1885, Eng. transl., *The Education of Daughters*, e. g. Dublin, 1841] a book characterized by deep psychologic insight into the mental life of the child, and one that has retained value to the present time. Starting out from the principle that education must content itself with following and supplementing the workings of nature, he lays it down that the exercise of love directed toward the confidence of the child, and the indirect form of imparting knowledge, are the true methods of the teacher, in opposition to the system of threats, punishments and categorical drill. At the same time he insists upon the importance of a solid grounding in religion, especially in Biblical history. In addition to instruction in religion, languages and history, the young girl should also be prepared for the various duties of domestic life.

After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Fénelon was one of the noted ecclesiastics sent into the provinces "to effect the conversion of the few Huguenots remaining in the country. His labors lay in the districts of Saintonge and Aunis. When he took leave of the king, he begged to be allowed to dispense with the usual military escort, saying that, after the example of the Apostles, he wished to accomplish a work of peace and love."

3. Missionary Labors.

Instead of combating heresy by acrimonious debate, he sought rather to attain his aim by the skilful and attractive exposition of the teachings of the Gospel, by the dissemination of Roman versions of the New Testament and missals, and by requiring the attendance of all children at Catholic schools. On the whole, however, he seems to have met with little success; and, impatient at the obstinacy of the heretics, he writes in Feb., 1686 to the secretary of state Seignelay: "The representatives of the king must in no way cease to keep a firm hand on those people, whom the slightest sign of conciliation renders so presumptuous;" then, giving information of the different routes by which the Huguenots were escaping abroad, he insists that the frontiers shall be guarded closely; "to render their sojourn in the country as tolerable as possible and their flight as dangerous as possible is the task." Fénelon's system of converting heretics, like that of the Roman Church of his time, was that the clergy should labor among them by means of preaching and loving persuasion, but invoke against the stubbornly recusant the "salutary pressure" of the worldly authorities.

After six months' labor in the missionary field, Fénelon returned to his post at the Nouvelles Converties. His remarkable gifts had attracted attention before this, and in 1689, when the duke of Beauvilliers became governor to the grandchildren of Louis XIV., Fénelon was made preceptor to the princes, the eldest of whom, the duke of Burgundy, became his especial charge.

4. Tutorship of Duke of Burgundy.

For eight years Fénelon gave himself up with absolute devotion to the education of the young duke, who, combining unusual talents with a character in the highest degree stubborn, insolent, and pleasure-loving, offered an excellent opportunity for the exercise of Fénelon's splendid pedagogic talents. To train this child into a wise king (*roi philosophe*), a second St. Louis, was his aim. In combating the vices and supplementing the deficiencies of the lad, he displayed a remarkable resourcefulness that is evidenced especially in the different works he wrote for the young duke. His *Contes et fables*, his *Dialogues des morts*, his *Démonstration de l'existence de Dieu*, and his *Direction pour la conscience d'un roi*, all had a didactic purpose, which is present also in the most famous of his works, *Les aventures de Télémaque*. Fénelon succeeded in gaining an absolute influence over his pupil and in transforming him into a learned, affable, and modest youth. Fénelon's praise was in every mouth for the wonder he had wrought. He enjoyed the highest favor at the court, and as a reward for his services Louis XIV. made him, in 1695, archbishop of Cambrai. Yet his obligations to the king did not prevent him from speaking out boldly in criticism of the policy of Louis XIV. In a letter, the authenticity of which has been demonstrated by the discovery of the original, Fénelon attacks the monarch's vanity, worldliness, and love of power with a boldness that amounts to absolute temerity.

From his splendid position at court Fénelon fell suddenly as a result of the part he played in the conflict over the mystical doctrines of Mme. Guyon. When these were declared heretical by an in estigating commission which included Bossuet and Noailles, Fénelon, dissenting from the majority in certain important reservations, published the *Explication des maximes des saints*, in which Mme. Guyon's fundamental principles were formulated in a sober and guarded manner. All love of God, Fénelon laid down, which was conditioned only by the fear of punishment or by the desire of earthly happiness was only an extremely imperfect copy of the pure unselfish love which consists in the adoration of God for his own sake. "Even though God—indeed an impossible supposition—should destroy the souls of the just or abandon them for eternity to the temptations and pains of this life, or condemn them for all eternity to the pains of hell, these souls would none the less love him and serve him faithfully" The style in which this work is written is dry, dogmatic, without grace or unction; and as the principles laid down are frequently followed by contradictory explanations and qualifications, it contains much that is

5. Championship of Mme. Guyon.

subtle and obscure. It created great excitement, almost every one taking part for or against it. Bossuet attacked it violently; Fénelon answered with self-restraint and dignity. Although Fénelon had the support of the Jesuits, and in secret, that of Le Tellier, confessor of Louis XIV., most of the clergy adhered to Bossuet, upon whose side, too, the monarch ranged himself. Fénelon was banished to his see city of Cambrai, whereupon he appealed to the pope for judgment upon his book. After a long delay and urgent pressure from Louis XIV., decision was rendered, declaring several passages of his work erroneous (not heretical). Fénelon publicly proclaimed the papal decision and caused as many copies of his book as he could obtain to be burned. It is open to question, however, whether his submission was sincere. That he held fast to his opinions at a later date is manifest from a letter to Le Tellier in which, speaking of his conflict with Bossuet, he says "He who was in error has conquered and he who was free from error is overcome." As a matter of fact the papal judgment, rendered so unwillingly and in so mild a form, did Fénelon no harm, but gained him sympathy and increased love and admiration.

6. Conduct of His Diocese.

It is in the last period of his life, during eighteen years of labor in his diocese (1697–1715) that Fénelon showed himself in the noblest light. Devoted to his pastoral duties, he made himself thoroughly acquainted with conditions in every part of his jurisdiction, giving himself up especially to the task of training worthy priests and removing for this purpose the diocesan seminary from Valenciennes to Cambrai where it enjoyed his personal supervision. A master of pulpit oratory himself, he combated the prevailing taste for declamation, laying down as the threefold object of the preacher to convince, paint, and persuade. During the war of the Spanish Succession (1702–13) his diocese was repeatedly the scene of hostilities. In 1709, when the country around Cambrai was laid waste by the enemy, Fénelon turned his palace into a refuge for the inhabitants of entire villages, and gave his personal care to the sick and wounded. He placed his episcopal income at the disposal of the government for the relief of famine. The nobility of his conduct did not fail to impress even the foe, and Prince Eugene and the duke of Marlborough established guards for the protection of his personal property during the occupation of the country by the allies.

In the Jansenist controversy Fénelon took an active part as an opponent of the teachings of the bishop of Ypres. He requested the pope to obtain from the king the dismissal of all dignitaries who should refuse to subscribe to the anti-Jansenist formula, and their excommunication in case of obstinate opposition. He gave unconditional support to the bull *Unigenitus* directed against the Jansenists. On the other hand, to the Protestants of the country he maintained, according to some authorities, an attitude that went to the extreme of tolerance. His pastoral duties still left him time for literary activity. As a member of the French Academy his advice was called for in the work on the great dictionary. As a judge in the conflict between the Ancients and the Moderns, he praised the classic writers because they depicted nature with power and grace, carried out their characters consistently, and attained harmony. At this time he brought together the different fragments of the *Télémaque* into an orderly whole. The book achieved a tremendous success, not only in France, where it was speedily prohibited, but throughout Europe. Fénelon has been accused unjustly of intending this romance as a satire upon the government of Louis XIV., a view against which the author vehemently protested. Nevertheless the book itself contains echoes and images of the time. The work is written in a highly attractive style and reveals a sound knowledge of antiquity. What detracts from it is the blending of Greek mythology with Christian doctrine and ethics, of antiquity with modern times, a process resulting in a general impression of unreality. Although the king had forbidden all intercourse between Fénelon and the duke of Burgundy, the two remained in constant communication through common friends. On important occasions the young duke turned for advice to his old teacher, and when the death of the Dauphin (1711) made the duke heir to the throne, a new career seemed about to open for Fénelon. But if he entertained hopes of playing the part of a Mazarin or a Richelieu, the death of the duke in the following year dashed them to the ground. On hearing the fatal news he remarked "My ties are now severed—nothing more binds me to earth." The last years of his life were passed in partial retirement and devotion.

7. Télémaque.

Fénelon's numerous literary, theological and political writings offer abundant testimony to the versatility of his talents and the wide extent of his knowledge. Similarly many-sided does his character appear. By nature mild, he was stern to himself and often severe to those who differed from him in belief. With a strong bent for mysticism, he nevertheless possessed remarkable insight into practical affairs and conditions. Insisting as a theologian upon "a pure and unselfish love for God" and revealing as archbishop a spirit of noble sacrifice and of devoted service toward the poor and the suffering, he aspired at the same time to power and dominion. An earnest champion of authority and established doctrine in the Roman Catholic Church and an opponent of all religious innovations, he showed himself, in the field of politics and social science an advocate of ideals bordering on Utopianism. In an age when absolutism was regarded as almost a divine principle, Fénelon was the first to speak of popular rights and the popular welfare. In this manner his ideas represent an anticipation of the eighteenth century, whose philosophers, notably D'Alembert, praise him highly. On the whole, in spite of certain defects, we may decidedly place him among the noblest characters and most talented writers of his day. (J. Ehni†.)

8. Estimate of His Character.

Bibliography: An edition of Fénelon's works, with *Vie* by Y. M. M. de Querbœuf, was published, 9 vols., 1787–

1792; another, containing his correspondence, was issued, in 19 vols., ib. 1826–28; the *Vies des anciens philosophes* and the *Télémaque* have been translated often into most European languages; M. Masson edited the unpublished letters of Fénelon to Madame Guyon, Freiburg, Switzerland, 1907. Lives have been written by L. F. de Bausset, Paris, 1809, Eng. transl., London, 1810; [H. L. Farrer,] ib. 1877 (an excellent work); E. de Broglie, Paris, 1884; P. Janet, ib. 1892, Eng. transl., London, 1893; R. Mahrenholz, Leipsic, 1896; Viscount St. Cyres, London, 1901; H. Druon, Paris, 1905. Consult also: E. O. Douen, *L'Intolérance de Fénelon*, Paris, 1872; G. Bizos, *Fénelon éducateur*, Paris, 1886; E. K. Sanders, *Fénelon, his Friends and Enemies*, London, 1901; M. Cagnac, *Fénelon, directeur de conscience*, Paris, 1902. See also literature under GUYON, JEANNE MARIE BOUVIER DE LA MOTHE.

FENN, WILLIAM WALLACE: Unitarian; b. at Boston, Mass., Feb. 12, 1862. He was graduated at Harvard in 1884 and Harvard Divinity School in 1887 He was minister of Unity Church, Pittsfield, Mass., 1887–91 and of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago 1891–1901. Since 1901 he has been Bussey professor of systematic theology in Harvard Divinity School, of which he has been dean since 1906. He was Shaw Lecturer on Biblical literature in Meadville Theological School 1892–1901 and preacher to Harvard University 1896–1898 and again since 1902. He has been American editor of the *Hibbert Journal* since 1902, and has written *Lessons on Luke* (in collaboration with H. G. Spaulding; Boston, 1890); *Lessons on the Acts* (1894); *The Flowering of the Hebrew Religion* (Chicago, 1894); and *Lessons on the Psalms* (Boston, 1900).

FENTON, FERRAR: Church of England layman; b. at Waltham (18 m. s.e. of Hull), Lincolnshire, Dec. 4, 1832. He was educated privately, and until the age of twenty-eight lived the life of a student. Financial reverses then compelled him to become an operator in a factory, where he eventually rose to be manager and overseer. He undertook various commercial enterprises, and amassed a fortune as the promoter of the De Beers Company for the development of the South African diamond mines after the panic of 1882, but in 1893 lost heavily through the dishonesty of a legal adviser. Since then, however, he has recovered much of his wealth. In theology he holds to the authenticity and divine origin of the Bible, and regards "the so-called 'higher criticism' as either wild delusion or deliberate swindle." He has a knowledge of many languages and has written various pamphlets, linguistic works, and biographies, but his chief work is his *Bible in Modern English with Critical Notes* (London, 1903; published first in parts, 1883–1903), an independent translation from the original languages.

FERDINAND II. AND THE COUNTERREFORMATION IN AUSTRIA.

Early Progress of the Reformation (§ 1).
Reaction under Rudolph II. (§ 2).
Protestant Gains after 1600 (§ 3).
Forces Working for the Roman Catholics (§ 4).
Ferdinand II. His Measures in Inner Austria (§ 5).
Ferdinand Emperor 1619–27 (§ 6).

The culminating point of the Reformation and Counterreformation occurs a full generation later in the Austrian crown lands of the Hapsburgs than elsewhere in Germany; the decisive issue, adversely to the Reformation, does not appear before the first third of the Thirty Years' War, under the rule of Emperor Ferdinand II. When in 1564 the Austrian lands passed from the hand of Ferdinand I. into the hands of his three sons, Maximilian, Ferdinand, and Charles, the Reformation had made nearly equal progress in all these jurisdictions; on all sides it had been tacitly tolerated, and had accordingly gained such accretions that the complete transition to Protestantism appeared to depend only on its recognition by law and the creation of a church organization. The majority of all classes of society had adopted the new ideas. In Bohemia and Moravia, in Silesia and Lusatia, in Upper and Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, and Göritz, nearly the entire population was filled with the new spirit. In Tyrol alone did the Roman Church continue securely predominant.

1. Early Progress of the Reformation.

Maximilian II., in Bohemia (with its dependencies, Moravia, Silesia, Lusatia) and Upper and Lower Austria, and Archduke Charles in Inner Austria (Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Göritz) continued at first in the tolerant disposition of their father. There soon followed most important concessions to the Protestant territorial estates. In Lower Austria, from 1568 to 1571, Maximilian granted religious freedom for the nobility and their subjects; the same concession was straightway claimed for themselves by the Upper Austrians, and it was not denied them, although it was never formally extended to them. The Bohemian nobility obtained the like religious freedom in 1575. In Inner Austria, from 1572 to 1578, Charles accorded the so-called religious pacification, which allowed the lords and knighthood to profess the Augsburg Confession and tolerated Protestant schools and churches already existent; only for the crown cities and towns and for his own estates did the archduke retain express control of religion. Charles made these concessions with the utmost reluctance; nothing but need of money and the threatening danger from the Turks constrained him to do so. Indeed a similar external pressure was operative in the case of Maximilian II.; but his religious sensibilities suffered less by the concession, as he had considerable sympathy with the new views.

The first lawful foundations for the development of a Protestant Church were won through these concessions; but under the impulse of an energetic reaction that was developing with new force in Romanism, the successors of these princes, supported by the Jesuits and the Roman Catholic remnant of the nobility, strove to set the concessions aside. In 1578, Rudolph II. (son of Maximilian II., emperor 1576–1612) began to expel all the Protestant preachers from Vienna; but when he encountered strong opposition to his designs in Upper Austria, he set to work more prudently. Nevertheless he achieved a good deal during the following decade; by legal proceedings, one church after another was taken away from the Protestant nobles of Lower Austria and restored to the Roman

2. Reaction under Rudolph II.

worship, while entire towns were led back to the ancient faith, thus paving the way as far as possible for the party of Catholic restoration. The situation in Lower Austria stopped short of any formally compacted procedure on the side of the Protestant estates; but in Upper Austria the opposition against all these measures maintained itself till 1597, at last flaming up into the peasants' insurrection of 1595–97, which had its origin in economic distress and the straits of the Church. With this insurrection the Protestant opposition was at the same time decisively suppressed by superior force of arms. A "reformation committee" thereupon began its relentless activity; the nobility, indeed, were still allowed the exercise of Protestant worship in their castles, but the citizens and peasants were so hard pressed in the course of a few years that by the beginning of the seventeenth century the dominion of the Roman Church in Upper Austria was outwardly restored. However, a large portion of the population remained Protestant at heart.

3. Protestant Gains after 1600.

From about 1600, Rudolph II. was diseased in mind. The consequences of his condition were so disastrous, at last, for the government of his dominions that in 1604 it seemed as though a collapse of his rule, and, with it, of the Hapsburg power, were imminent. The emperor's nearest kinsmen sought to obviate the danger by leaguing themselves against Rudolph and preparing to supplant him through his younger brother Matthias. Rudolph not being tractable, Matthias resorted to open conflict, and to strengthen his power he had to entreat the aid of the estates of Hungary and the crown lands and to fortify himself by concessions. In 1606 he promised the Hungarian Protestants free exercise of religion, and guaranteed the Moravian estates against all manner of religious persecution. It proved more difficult for him to make terms with the Austrian estates; these demanded, before the act of homage, complete religious freedom and new statutory rights for themselves. Nevertheless Matthias reluctantly yielded in the essential points, while the estates employed this time of independence in reorganizing the church on Protestant lines and in instituting public worship and schools on all sides accordingly. The same conditions favored the estates in Bohemia; as a condition of supporting the emperor against Matthias they first obtained provisional religious freedom, and then, on July 9, 1609, the imperial brief in solemn acknowledgment of religious freedom and the ecclesiastical organization of the Protestants. Similar results were achieved for themselves by the Silesian estates. On succeeding to the crown lands and the empire in 1612, Matthias confirmed the grants by his brother.

The conflict between Rudolph and Matthias had much strengthened the position of the Austrian Protestants; apart from Tyrol and Inner Austria, the situation was now as favorable as at the close of the reign of Maximilian II. But there were some weighty differences. Zealous and closely compacted Roman minorities stood side by side with the Protestant estates of the realm; the Roman Church had gained internal strength; the Jesuits had founded settlements and schools in all the important centers, exerting an influence over the coming generation; the university at Graz belonged to them outright, and Vienna was transferred to them in 1617; the Capuchins likewise exerted a fruitful activity. And still tenser than formerly had grown the opposition between the government and the Protestant estates; ecclesiastical and political points of contention had become inseparably interwoven, and Protestantism and "estatism" belonged together like Catholicism and imperialism. The more the power of the estates increased, and the more distinctly the nobility strove for a federation of all the Bohemian and Austrian estates, just so much the more hostile became the attitude of the monarchy toward all rights and strivings of the estates. Matthias at first allowed things to take their course; but when he contrived, in 1617, to induce the estates to "accept" Ferdinand of Styria as prospective successor to the royal dignity, his courage rose in the direction of Counterreformation measures. The consequence was the Bohemian uprising, and Bohemia's assertion of independence of the Hapsburg dynasty; a Protestant prince, Frederick V. of the Palatinate, was elected king. But with the suppression of the Bohemian insurrection, came likewise the final, decisive defeat of Austrian Protestantism. Ferdinand II., the successor of Matthias, became the restorer of Roman Catholicism for all Austria, just as Matthias had been for Inner Austria two decades previously (see INNER AUSTRIA, THE REFORMATION IN).

4. Forces Working for the Roman Catholics.

5. Ferdinand II. His Measures in Inner Austria.

Ferdinand (b. at Graz July 9, 1578; d. in Vienna Feb. 15, 1637) had received a strictly ecclesiastical education, first at Graz, then at the University of Ingolstadt; his favorite reading, thanks to the influence of the Jesuits, was edifying tracts and legends of the saints. He succeeded his father, the Archduke Charles, in 1590 and began to reign actively in 1595, with the firm resolve to help forward the Roman Church once again to victory. At the end of June, 1598, he began to institute summary measures throughout Inner Austria. Protestant preachers and teachers were expelled, the Protestant churches were closed, Protestant subjects were directed to choose between return to Romanism and emigration; even the nobility were forbidden the exercise of Protestant worship, their confession of faith being alone left free. Later, when at the height of his success in 1628, Ferdinand enjoined the nobility to return to the Roman Church within a year at the latest. So-called "reformation committees" were active throughout the country; the Jesuits now extended their labors more widely than ever; while the prohibition of foreign schools restricted all aspirants for education to the schools of the Society of Jesus. Ferdinand allowed nothing to disturb him in carrying out his policy; neither the remonstrances of his counselors, of the emperor, nor of the Protestant estates of the realm, caused him to halt. The opposition of his nobility, the vigorous resistance

of the people at large, frequently manifested, proved all in vain; his own sovereign power, energetically applied, showed itself strong enough to execute his will with promptness. By 1602, the Counterreformation was completed in the central Austrian jurisdictions, though at the cost of a serious and irretrievable decline of their prosperity, since many of the stanchest and wealthiest inhabitants had left home for the sake of their faith.

When Ferdinand, after the death of Matthias in 1619, had been elected emperor, his first step, in alliance with Maximilian of Bavaria and the League, was to put down the Bohemian in-

6. Ferdinand Emperor 1619–27.

surrection. Then from 1621 forward, began the systematic execution of the Counterreformation in Bohemia, Moravia, and Upper and Lower Austria. In Bohemia first the Protestant teachers and preachers were expelled from the country, attendance at Roman Catholic worship was made compulsory, and the people were given the choice between subjection and emigration; in this case the property of emigrants was confiscated. In the cities, Catholic municipal counselors were put in office, and the Protestants were excluded from all municipal and civil positions. Military billeting helped to break the spirit of the recalcitrant, while rewards were bestowed for transition to Romanism. From 1624, measures were also prosecuted against the nobility, and in July, 1627, there was issued an imperial patent to the effect that nobody should be tolerated in the land unless he were Roman Catholic, and this irrespective of his rank or station, the nobility being granted a term of six months for making the change, and a corresponding term for the sale of their properties in the event of disobeying these orders. In the course of some years Protestantism was effectually suppressed in Bohemia. Similar procedure was followed in Moravia and Lower Austria, where, however, the nobility remained exempt from compulsory conversion; not until 1641 were more severe measures inaugurated against them, because they were alleged to stand in allianee with the Swedes. In Upper Austria the Counterreformation dated only from 1624, and was virtually accomplished by 1626.

The last active manifestations of Protestant views in central Austria were set aside in 1628 by the expulsion of the Protestant nobles, to the reported number of 800. In Silesia, too, notwithstanding earlier promise to the contrary, Protestantism was antagonized from 1627 onward; although in this case only particular jurisdictions came to be Romanized anew, which the fortunes of war brought completely under the emperor's hand. To carry the Counterreformation through in Hungary was not in Ferdinand's power, but as time progressed, the peaceable Counterreformation was directed by Cardinal Peter Pázmány (q.v.), archbishop of Gran, and achieved such results that at all events the majority of the nobility again became Roman Catholic. As concerns the internal affairs of Austria, the victory of the Counterreformation was likewise the defeat of the estates and their policy; the princes needed no longer to fear the claims of self-willed estates.

WALTER GOETZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. von Hurter, *Geschichte Ferdinands II.*, 4 vols., Schaffhausen, 1850–64; F. Stieve, *Politik Baierns*, vol. i., Munich, 1878; idem, *Der oberösterreichische Bauernaufstand des 1626*, ib. 1891; T. Wiedemann, *Reformation und Gegenreformation im Lande unter der Enns*, i.–v., Prague, 1879–86; J. Hirn, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II. von Tirol*, Innsbruck, 1885; H. Ziegler, *Die Gegenreformation in Schlesien*, Halle, 1888; F. Scheichl, *Bilder aus der Zeit der Gegenreformation*, Gotha, 1890; A. Gindely, *Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, Leipsic, 1894; J. Loserth, *Die steirische Religionspazifikation*, Graz, 1896; idem, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in den innerösterreichischen Ländern*, Stuttgart, 1898; L. Schuster, *Fürstbischof Martin Brenner*, Graz, 1898; A. R. Pennington, *The Counter-Reformation in Europe*, London, 1899; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. iii., *Wars of Religion*, pp. 568–569, 572–573, 575, 687, 689, 702, 714 sqq., 723 sqq., New York, 1905.

FERGUSON (FERGUSSON), DAVID: Scotch Reformer; b., perhaps at Dundee, c. 1525; d. at Dunfermline (16 m.n.w. of Edinburgh), Fifeshire, Aug. 13, 1598. He was a glover by trade, but later acquired an education, though there is no evidence that he ever attended a university. He was one of the earliest teachers of the Reformed doctrines, being chosen pastor at Dunfermline in the first appointment of ministers in Scotland in 1560. In 1567 he was also made pastor of Rosyth, for which Cumnock and Beith were substituted in 1574. He preached before the regent at Leith on Jan. 13, 1571–72, protesting against the alienation of the estates of the Church for the personal use of the nobility or governmental purposes. This sermon received the approval of the General Assembly of the same year, and was heartily indorsed by John Knox. Ferguson was moderator of the General Assembly in 1573 and again in 1578, and for a number of years he was one of the assessors to the moderator. His acquaintance with James I. as well as his ready wit, caused him to be repeatedly chosen one of the deputies of the General Assembly when it wished to bring matters to the attention of the king, and in Aug., 1583, he was one of the seven ministers cited by the king to attend a convention held at St. Andrews to answer for certain proceedings of the Assembly. At the meeting of the Synod of Fife at Cupar in Feb. 1597–98, Ferguson was the oldest minister in Scotland, but was still able to protest vigorously against any measure which he considered conducive to the reintroduction of episcopacy into Scotland. The works of Ferguson were: *An Answer to an Epistle written by Renat Benedict, the French Doctor, to John Knox* (Edinburgh, 1563); the sermon already noted (1572); the posthumous *Scottish Proverbs* (1641); and *Epithalamium mysticum Solomonis regis, sive Analysis critico-poetica Cantici Canticorum* (1677). His *Tracts* were edited at Edinburgh for the Bannatyne Club in 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: John Row, *Historie of the Kirk of Scotland* (Wodrow Society publication), Edinburgh, 1842; Introductory notice to the Bannatyne Club's reprint of Ferguson's *Tracts*, ib. 1869; Hew Scott, *Fasti ecclesiæ Scotianæ*, II., ii. 565–566, 3 vols., ib. 1866–71; *DNB*, xviii, 341–342.

FERGUSON, FERGUS: Evangelical Union of Scotland; b. at Glasgow Sept. 6, 1824; d. there Nov. 3, 1897 At the age of fourteen he entered Glasgow University and was graduated (B.A.) at the end of six sessions (M.A., some years later).

He then studied at the (Congregational) Glasgow Theological Academy under Ralph Wardlaw until 1844, when, with eight other students, he was expelled for not believing in the doctrine of unconditional election and the special and irresistible influence of the Holy Spirit. His studies were completed in the Theological Hall of the Evangelical Union (q.v.) under James Morison (q.v.), and he was ordained pastor of a newly formed church of the Evangelical Union in Glasgow in Mar., 1845. The church grew under Ferguson's ministration and a new building was twice found necessary. He became a leader of his denomination and was professor of New Testament exegesis and literature in the Theological Hall. His preaching was popular and he was honored as one of the most useful citizens of Glasgow. For some years he edited the *Evangelical Repository* and he published many popular volumes, including *Bible Election* (Glasgow, 1854); *Letters on the Principal Points of a Calvinistic Controversy* (1854); *A Treatise on Peace with God* (1856); *Holiness; or what we should be and do* (1862); *Sacred Scenes; Notes of Travel in Egypt and the Holy Land* (London, 1864); *The History of the Evangelical Union* (1876; *A Popular Life of Christ* (1878); *From Glasgow to Missouri and Back* (Glasgow, 1878); *The Character of God* (London, 1881); *The Patriarchs* (1882).

WILLIAM ADAMSON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Life* by William Adamson, London, 1900.

FERGUSON, SAMUEL DAVID: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Cape Palmas and parts adjacent; b., of African descent, at Charlestown, S. C., Jan. 1, 1842. At the age of six he was taken by his parents to Liberia, where he was educated in the church mission schools and received his theological training from the mission clergy. He was ordered deacon in 1865 and priested two years later, after which he was rector of St. Mark's, Harper, Liberia, until 1885, being also a teacher in the boys' boarding-school at Cavalla 1862–63 and master of Mount Vaughan high school 1863–73. In 1885 he was consecrated missionary bishop of Cape Palmas and parts adjacent, and was the first negro to be elevated to the Protestant Episcopal episcopate.

FERMENTARII (FERMENTACEI). See AZYMITES.

FERRAR, NICHOLAS: English clergyman; b. in London Feb. 22, 1592; d. at Little Gidding (10 m. n.w. of Huntingdon), Huntingdonshire, Dec. 4, 1637. He studied at Clare Hall, Cambridge (B.A., 1610; M.A., 1613). From 1613 to 1618 he traveled and studied in Germany, Italy, France, and Spain, and on his return to England devoted himself till 1623 to the affairs of the Virginia Company, in which his family was interested. In 1624 he was elected to Parliament, and took part in the impeachment of the Earl of Middlesex. But he soon tired of public life, and, shrinking from the impending political disorders, with his widowed mother, and the families of his brother and his brother-in-law, John Collet, he settled at Little Gidding, and established there what the Puritans called his Protestant nunnery. In 1626 he was ordained deacon by Laud, but would never consent to take priest's orders, and the most flattering offers of valuable benefices were not sufficient to tempt him from his life of religious devotion. Matins and evensong were said daily by Ferrar in the church of Little Gidding, the other canonical hours being said in the manor house. One room was set apart as an oratory for general devotions, and there were two separate oratories for the men and women at night. Vigils were kept throughout the night; and Ferrar himself, who slept on the floor, arose at one o'clock in the morning for religious meditation. Everything was done by rule, and there was some definite occupation for every hour. It was Ferrar's theory that everybody should learn a trade; and bookbinding was taught in his institution. Numerous elaborate volumes bound here are still extant, including a copy of Ferrar's Harmony of the Gospels (1635) made for Charles I., who held Ferrar in great veneration and visited him in 1642, and again in 1646. Ferrar also provided a free school for the children of the neighborhood, and served himself as teacher. The institution soon attracted the enmity of Puritanism. In 1641 it was unjustly attacked in a pamphlet entitled *The Arminian Nunnery;* and early in 1647 the manor and the church at Little Gidding were sacked by the Parliamentary army. The church was carefully restored in 1853.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Two lives, by his brother John Ferrar and Dr. Jebb, are reproduced in *Cambridge in the 17th Century*, ed. J. E. B. Mayor, Cambridge, 1855; F. Turner, *Brief Memoirs of Nicholas Ferrar*, London, 1837; P. Peckard, *Memoirs of Nicholas Ferrar*, Cambridge, 1790, abridged London, 1852; T. T. Carter, *Nicholas Ferrar; his Household and his Friends*, ib. 1892; *DNB*, xviii. 377–380.

FERRAR, ROBERT: Bishop of St. David's; b. near Halifax (14 m. w.s.w. of Leeds), Yorkshire, before 1509; burned at Carmarthen, Wales, Mar. 30, 1555. He probably studied at Cambridge, afterward at Oxford (B.D., 1533), where he became a canon regular of the order of St. Augustine and a member of the priory of St. Mary's. He read Luther's works, became a Reformer, and in 1528 was compelled to recant. Later he aided Henry VIII. in suppressing the monasteries, and in 1540, a pension of eighty pounds a year was bestowed upon him, a large amount for those times. During the reign of Edward VI. he enjoyed the patronage of the Duke of Somerset, who employed him in carrying on the Reformation. He was elevated to the see of St. David's in 1548; but on his arrival in his diocese in 1549 he found serious difficulties awaiting him. Technical flaws were found in his commission, false charges were trumped up against him. Somerset, now in the Tower, could do nothing for him, and in 1551 Ferrar was thrown into prison and kept there till the accession of Queen Mary. He was deprived of his bishopric in Mar., 1554, condemned as a heretic a year later, and was burned at Carmarthen on Mar. 30, 1555. To a bystander who commiserated him he remarked, "If you see me once to stir while I suffer the pains of burning, then give no credit to those doctrines for which I die." He made good his assertion, for he did not move till a blow on the head felled him in the midst of the flames.

Bibliography: John Fox, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. J. Townsend, v. 428, vi. 146, 222, 553, 664, 705, vii. 1–28, 8 vols., London, 1837–41; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, ii. 759–761, 4 vols., ib. 1813–20; G. Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, ed. N. Pocock, ii. 127, iii. 350, 362, v. 197–205, Oxford, 1865; *DNB*, xviii. 380–382 (contains good list of sources).

FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF: An assembly which met at Ferrara early in 1438 to consider proposals for union between the Greek and Latin Churches. The great danger threatening the Greek empire at the hands of the Turks led the emperor, John Palæologus, to disregard the aversion generally felt in the East for Rome and to make proposals for a union of the two branches of Christendom to both the pope, Eugenius IV., and the Council of Basel, which was in session at the time. The pope was unwilling that the council—with which his relations were anything but amicable—(see Basel, Council of; Eugenius IV.) should share in the glory of a possible successful outcome of negotiations, and thought his purposes would be better served if its sessions were transferred to an Italian city. Toward the end of 1437 he directed it to meet at Ferrara on Jan. 8, 1438. A complete rupture between pope and council resulted, the majority of the latter remaining at Basel, where they deposed the pope. A minority, however, who were favorable to the pope met at Ferrara. Early in Mar., 1438, the Greeks, about 700 persons, arrived at Ferrara as guests of the pope; the emperor arrived on the fourth of the month, the patriarch of Constantinople on the seventh. Prominent among the Greeks were Bessarion, archbishop of Nicæa, afterward cardinal of the Church of Rome (see Bessarion, Johannes), a friend of union, and Markos Eugenikos (q.v.), metropolitan of Ephesus, whose one thought was to defend the peculiarities of the Greek peoples against the imperious papacy; it was mainly due to his influence that the dogmatic discussions on the doctrinal differences, especially on the procession of the Holy Spirit, held in 1438 were without result. Financial difficulties obliged the pope to transfer the council to Florence. Here the first session was held Feb. 26, 1439, and the metropolitan Isidore of Kief was especially conspicuous as friend of the Union. After much discussion it was agreed that the terms used by the Church Fathers —the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and from the Father through the Son—are in the main identical (see Filioque Controversy). By this the Greeks had actually acknowledged the authority of the *filioque;* but in no case would they adopt it in their symbol; they declared, however, their willingness to unite with the Latins retaining their own rites. In the beginning of June, 1439 the discussions of the *filioque* could be considered as closed; those on purgatory, the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist, the sacrifice of the mass, etc., were relatively unimportant. But the whole union-scheme threatened to become again doubtful when the question concerning the "papacy" came up for discussion. A formula was invented, however, which each party could interpret according to its own view (see below). In the midst of these negotiations the patriarch of Constantinople died, June 10, 1439, and a termination of the discussions seemed more than ever desirable. On July 5 an agreement was arrived at, but Markos Eugenikos refused to sign it; another opponent to the union, the bishop of Stauropolis had already fled from Florence. It is noteworthy that the decree was signed by 115 Latins and by only thirty-three Greeks. The union-document was prepared in Latin and Greek by Ambrose Traversari, and corrections were afterward made here and there in the Greek by Bessarion. Both the Greek and Latin text may be considered authentic. On July 6, 1439, the solemn consummation of the union was celebrated in the cathedral at Florence. Cardinal Cesarini read the decree in Latin, Bessarion in Greek; after its general adoption Pope Eugenius celebrated public mass.

As concerns the contents of the decree, the main doctrinal difference was adjusted on paper, as already stated; the Greeks acknowledged the correctness of the *filioque*, without adopting it in their symbol. The other points—on the Eucharist, purgatory, etc.—were non-essential. The Greeks retained their whole ritual and marriage of the priests. Regarding the pope, a formula was adopted which the Greeks could and did interpret as acknowledging his primacy "*in the way which* is determined in the acts of ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons." The patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem could thus imagine they had preserved their privileges. The Latins, however, interpreted the last clause as a confirmation of their claims and read, the pope has the primacy in the church, "*as* is determined in the acts of ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons" (the original copy of the decree with other copies is at Florence in the Laurentian library). On Aug. 26, 1439 the emperor left for Constantinople by way of Venice. A real union had not been accomplished, the Greeks would not "Latinize," the fall of Constantinople was not prevented, and in 1472 a synod in Constantinople solemnly and openly renounced the union of Florence. Paul Tschackert.

Bibliography: Sources: The original protocols are lost, but the preliminary negotiations are brought together by E. Cecconi, *Studi storici sul concilio di Firenze*, Florence, 1869; the Acts of the Council, compiled by O. Giustiniani, are in Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. xxxi and Labbe, *Concilia*, xiii. 825 sqq. (from the Latin standpoint); the *Acta Græca*, by Dorotheus of Mitylene, are in Harduin, *Concilia*, vol. ix., and in Mansi, vol. xxxi (from the Greek standpoint); the "Great History" of the Greek Sylvester Syropulus, giving the views of a divergent Greek party, was published by R. Creyghton, London, 1660; the union decree appeared, ed. Milanesi, in *Archivio storico Italiano*, new ser., vi (1857), 219. The modern Latin point of view appears in Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. 659 sqq.; the Greek, by Gorski, in *Hist. of the Council of Florence*, ed. Neale, London, 1861. Consult further: A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und dem Occident*, Munich, 1864; T. Fromman, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kirchenvereinigungen*, Halle, 1872; idem, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, xxii. 4 (1877), 659 sqq.; J. Dräseke, in *ZWT*, xxxvii (1894), 31 sqq.; Pastor, *Popes*, i. 315 sqq.; Creighton, *Papacy*, ii. 333–341, 382–384.

FERRARI, ANDREAS: Cardinal; b. at Pratopiano, diocese of Parma, Italy, Aug. 13, 1850. He was appointed in 1885 professor of dogmatic theology and rector of the Great Seminary of Parma.

Later becoming vicar-general of Parma, he was consecrated bishop of Guastalla in 1890, whence he was translated to Como in the following year. In 1894 he was enthroned archbishop of Milan, and in the same year was created cardinal priest of Sant'Anastasia. He is a member of the congregations of Bishops and Regulars, Indulgences, and the Index.

FERRATA, DOMENICO: Cardinal; b. at Gradoli, diocese of Montefiascone (50 m. n.w. of Rome), Italy, Mar. 4, 1847. He studied at the Jesuit colleges at Orvieto and Montefiascone, and at the University of Rome. He was then professor of canon law at the Roman Seminary and also professor of church history, exegesis, dogmatic theology, and the institutes of ecclesiastical law at the Propaganda. In 1877 he became a member of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, and in 1879 was appointed auditor of the papal nuncio at Paris. After his return to Italy, he was made undersecretary of his Congregation and domestic prelate to the pope, and in 1884 he was president of the Pontificia Accademia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici. In 1885 he was preconized titular archbishop of Thessalonica and sent to Belgium as papal nuncio. On his return, he became secretary of his congregation, and in 1891 was nuncio at Paris. He was created cardinal priest of Santa Prisca in 1896. He is a member of the Congregations of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, the Council, Rites, the Inquisition, Studies, Indulgences, and Loreto, besides being a commissioner for the reunion of dissenting churches and for the apostolic visitation of the dioceses of Italy.

FERRER, VINCENTE. See VINCENT FERRER, SAINT.

FERRIER, fār''ryê', **JÉRÉMIE:** French Protestant; b. at Nîmes c. 1560; d. in Paris Sept. 26, 1626. He was pastor of the Protestant congregation at Alais, afterward at Nîmes, and in 1601 was appointed professor of theology at the academy at Nîmes. On the occasion of his inauguration he defended publicly the thesis that Pope Clement VIII. was the Antichrist, and later he won a great reputation by his sermons against the Jesuits. Nevertheless, some doubt of his sincerity arose in 1611; and in 1612, suspected of having sold out to the Romanists, he was suspended for six years by the Synod of Privas. So strong was the feeling against him that in the rioting which followed, Ferrier barely escaped with his life. In 1614 he went to Paris, abjured Protestantism, and subsequently became a counselor of state under Louis XIII. He published *De l'Antechrist et de ses marques, contre les calomnies des ennemis de l'église catholique* (Paris, 1615), in which he retracted his former anti-Romanist utterances; and *Le Catholique d'état* (1625), a defense of Richelieu's policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. Ménard, *Hist. . . de Nismes*, vol. v., 7 vols., Paris, 1750–58; A. Borrel, *Hist. de l'église réformée de Nismes*, Nimes, 1856; E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. H. L. Bordier, Paris, 1877–86; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 712–716.

FERRIS, ISAAC: American (Dutch) Reformed; b. in New York Oct. 9, 1799; d. at Roselle, N. J., June 16, 1873. He was graduated from Columbia College (1816) and the Rutgers Seminary (1820). He held pastorates in the Dutch Reformed Church at New Brunswick, N. J. (1821–24), Albany, N. Y. (1824–36), and the Market Street Church, New York (1836–53), and was president of the New York Sunday School Union (1837–73), also of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Dutch Reformed Church. In 1842 he was sent to Holland on behalf of American missionaries in the Dutch East Indies. He was chancellor of New York University (1852–70; emeritus 1870–73), and throughout his connection with the University he was professor of moral science and Christian evidences, also acting professor of constitutional and international law 1855–1869. Through his efforts the heavy debt under which the institution had labored since its foundation was removed, several new departments were added to the course of instruction, and the standard of scholarship materially raised. He was also principal of the Rutgers Female Institute and president of its board of trustees. He published numerous occasional sermons and addresses, including *Jubilee Memorial of the American Bible Society; being a Review of its First Fifty Years of Work* (New York, 1867), an address delivered at the Jubilee of the American Bible Society at New York in 1866.

FERRIS, JOHN MASON: Dutch Reformed; b. at Albany, N. Y., Jan. 17, 1825. He was graduated from the University of the City of New York (A.B., 1843) and the New Brunswick Theological Seminary (1849). He was pastor of the Reformed Church at Tarrytown, N. Y. (1849–54), the Second Reformed Church at Chicago (1854–62), and the First Reformed Church at Grand Rapids, Mich. (1862–65). In 1865 he was appointed corresponding secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church in America, since 1883 has been editor of *The Christian Intelligencer* (New York), and treasurer of the Board of Foreign Missions since 1886.

FERRY, PAUL: French Protestant; b. at Metz Feb. 24, 1591; d. there July 28, 1669. He was educated at the seminary of Montauban and became pastor of the Reformed Congregation at Metz in 1612. Here he labored, as preacher and author, for fifty-seven years. He was a very prolific writer; but most of his works still remain in manuscript. His principal work is the *Catéchisme général de la Réformation de la Religion* (Sédan, 1654), in which he showed that the Reformation was a necessary result of the corruption of the Church. This book called forth a refutation from Bossuet, then canon and archdeacon of Metz. The disputation thus begun led to mutual esteem between the contestants, and in 1666 Ferry carried on a lengthy correspondence with Bossuet in the interest of a fusion of Protestantism and Catholicism, which was then being considered by the French government. He had already labored in vain to secure a union of the various branches of Protestantism, and had even induced John Durie (q.v.) to come to Metz in 1662 to discuss the subject with him. His *Lettre aux ministres de Genève* (in *Bibliothèque anglaise*, vol.

ii.), in defense of a poor lunatic who was burned at Geneva for blasphemies against the Trinity in 1632, has been called his best piece of writing. Ferry was an eloquent preacher, a man of learning, and had great influence among both Protestants and Roman Catholics.

Bibliography: H. M. Baird, *Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, i. 359–385, New York; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 717.

FESCH, JOSEPH: French cardinal, half-brother of Lætitia, mother of Napoleon I.; b. at Ajaccio, Corsica, Jan. 3, 1763; d. at Rome May 13, 1839. He studied at the seminary in Aix and became a priest before 1789. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he took service in the army, and in 1796 was Napoleon's commissary of war in Italy. When Napoleon was made consul he returned to the Church, and became archbishop of Lyons in 1802. The following year he was made a cardinal and sent to Rome as French ambassador. In 1804 he successfully negotiated for the coronation of the emperor by the pope at Paris, and in 1805 he was made Grand Almoner of France, Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, and a member of the Senate. Although until now he had been ready to further the interests of his illustrious nephew, he had no intention of completely surrendering his rights as cardinal. The result was a break with Napoleon; and in May, 1806, Fesch was recalled from Rome. In 1809 he declined the archbishopric of Paris, a peace-offering from Napoleon, and also declined to declare Napoleon's divorce of the same year valid. As president of the National Ecclesiastical Council at Paris in 1811 he led the opposition. Accordingly, the council was dissolved, and Fesch fell into complete disgrace. He retired to Lyons, and in 1814 to a nunnery he had established at Gravina, Italy. After Napoleon's return from Elba he was made a member of the House of Peers. On the restoration of the Bourbons he withdrew to Rome, leaving his bishopric in the hands of a vicar for twenty-four years. In 1856 Ajaccio, his native city, erected a monument to his memory. (C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: Lyonnet, *Le Cardinal Fesch*, 2 vols., Lyons, 1841; A. du Casse, *Hist. des négociations diplomatiques . . la correspondance inédite de l'empereur Napoléon avec le cardinal Fesch*, 3 vols., Paris, 1855; *KL*, iv. 1383–86.

FESTUS. See Felix and Festus.

FETISHISM.

The Word and Its Employment (§ 1).
Primary and Secondary Fetishism (§ 2).
Character of the Fetish (§ 3).
Operation Aided by Suggestion (§ 4).
Objects Employed and Area of Cult (§ 5).
Cases of Reversion (§ 6).

Fetishism (Portuguese *feitiço*, "charm, talisman") is a form of worship regarded as in itself superhumanly powerful in directing or assisting to the attainment of some desired end. The use of the word as denoting a religious cult goes back to C. de Brosses, *Du culte des dieux fétiches* (Paris, 1760), who rightly supposed that certain customs of the Africans constituted a form of primitive religion. The Portuguese term is the name given to the beads, medals, and crucifixes carried by sailors, and supposed by them to afford protection when in danger and was applied to the fetishes of the Africans by these same sailors, from whom De Brosses obtained it. In more modern treatises on religion the term has been used very loosely. Comte (*Philosophie positive*, Paris, 1830–42) made fetishism equivalent to animism. Lippert (*Die Religionen der europäischen Culturvölker*, Berlin, 1881) meant by it the embodiment of departed spirits in some tangible or visible object. Miss Kingsley and Mr. Nassau cover by it practically the whole of African religious life, though Miss Kingsley recognizes the looseness of her own usage. A delimitation of the term is necessary to abolish the confusion which has developed in its use. The *New English Dictionary* defines a fetish as "differing from an idol in that it is worshiped in its own character, not as the symbol, image, or occasional residence of a deity." Mr. Lang describes fetishism as "the worship of odds and ends," a description which admirably hits off the fortuitous selection of a fetish and the apparent lack of intrinsic worthfulness in the object chosen. Schultze regards it as "a religious worship of material objects," a definition which would suit many phases of animism. And Waitz defines a fetish as "an object of religious veneration, wherein the material and the spirit within it are regarded as one, the two being inseparable."

1. The Word and Its Employment.

The difficulties of the subject and the resulting confusion are due to two circumstances, its affinities and connections with animism on the one side and with magic on the other. In fetishism there is the same anthropomorphic conception of material objects as in animism; the most passive objects may be regarded as having volition and power to accomplish some end. A fetish is often used as the materials of magic are used and for similar purposes. But another cause of confusion is the fact that no distinction is made between a primitive and a developed variety. Primitive fetishism is suggested by Mr. Lang's description. The original fetish is an adventitious find of which care is taken, to which success in an undertaking is ascribed, and subsequent worship is accorded. The classic example is that of a Bushman who on leaving his hut to transact some important business trod on a stone which caused him some pain. He at once picked up the stone, regarding it as a fetish which had obtruded itself upon his notice for the purpose of forwarding his undertaking. His object was accomplished, and he thereafter paid the stone due homage. The adventitious meeting of this object at the moment of the inception of an enterprise was to the African an indication of its fetishistic character, and his success in the work proved for him its potency in that particular direction. Almost as classic is the case of the anchor cast up on the West African coast. A native broke off a fluke in order to utilize the iron, and soon after died. The natives thereafter on passing the spot always paid reverence to the anchor and frequently employed it as a destructive agent.

2. Primary and Secondary Fetishism.

The sequence of perception, events, and thought was the novelty of form of the object, the injury done it by breaking off the fluke, the subsequent death of the offender, and the inference that the anchor was a malignant fetish to be propitiated. On this principle any object of peculiar form—a deformed horn of a deer, the trigger of a gun, or any object dropped by a European, a queerly shaped stone, a particolored feather, a tooth, etc.—may become a fetish, the use of which may be indeterminate at the time but which is believed to possess power in some particular direction by reason of its very strangeness. But resemblance to an object or to the achievement desired plays no necessary part as it does in mimetic magic (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI. 1, a, § 5). Secondary fetishism shows a likeness to magic in that it is the result of the exercise of primitive invention like that which attempts to produce rain by simulating its fall. It is an attempt to force or create that which does not readily come to hand. Thus natives on the Guinea Coast take a joint of bamboo, a shell, or some similar object and fill it with oddly assorted materials; this they suppose furnishes a residence for a spirit which may be induced to enter the mass, make it its home, become one with it, and thus be available for assistance to the possessor. Or the home of the spirit may be a piece of wood carved into a rude resemblance to some object. In this case there is recognition of a distinction between the spirit and its home, a distinction which does not exist in primary fetishism, in which the stone, anchor, feather, etc., is itself a fetish. On another side the fetish is to be distinguished from charms, amulets and the like, by the fact that it is supposed to operate by its own inherent power, while charms work by virtue imparted from some higher power.

The fundamental character of a fetish is that the material object is itself the power and the object of worship and possesses personality and will. A second characteristic is that its power is not general, but is used for a definite end, usually material, and for a single kind of purpose. Hence for the various purposes of life the worshiper may accumulate a vast number of fetishes. A case is known where an individual had over 20,000, the use of each of which he professed to be able to describe. The assumed value and power of a fetish therefore depends upon accidental coincidence, upon the savage fallacy of *post hoc propter hoc*. Success in an undertaking makes almost certain the power of the fetish chosen for that particular purpose. But the fetishist may recognize after repeated failures that the object is worthless for the end in view and may then discard it. He will not, even then, admit its impotence but will assert that its power does not lie in that direction. The institution rests therefore upon a rude empiricism. The first essay with a fetish is a test which subsequent essays will either establish or disprove. A series of successes may occur which raise the value of the object so enormously that its service is desired by a tribe, and in that case the finder, who is supposed to know its peculiarities becomes a sort of priest. And the repute of the fetish may grow to such dimensions that its use becomes intertribal, the result being enlarged power and possessions and influence to both possessor and the home tribe.

3. Character of the Fetish.

While the individual use of the fetish is as various as the needs of man in the savage state, tribal and intertribal use of it is largely connected with a crude justice, with intertribal disputes, and with war. In cases of justice the operation is by means of suggestion or autosuggestion. Thus, in cases of suspected domestic infidelity or of theft the procedure is that of the Ordeal (q.v.). For example, where the lizard is fetish, in case of crime or offense the animal is caught and whipped, when the culprit, in terror of the vengeance of the fetish, confesses and makes restoration. Much the same process goes on in the case of intertribal disputes, while the tribe which has bought the aid of such a fetish for purposes of war is endowed with a confidence so bold as to be irresistible. Each success enhances the estimation in which the object is held. That out of this sort of fetish may have developed some of the great divinities found among savages is a possibility students of religion now recognize, and fetishism is regarded as one of the springs of polytheism. How it may contribute a priesthood is shown above. The qualities of humanity plus a superhuman power being attributed to the fetish, especially a jealous regard of its own prerogatives, it is an object of the highest care. It must be constantly conciliated. To please it, vows are undertaken which must be scrupulously performed. Thus vows are made for children during their infancy which enslave them for life to the service of the fetish whose protection is thus invoked. But failure to keep such a vow sets autosuggestion in operation, discouragement supervenes, and the death of the victim not seldom results from the terror excited. The same result often issues from the knowledge that an enemy has set a powerful fetish in operation against a man, especially where it is deemed impossible to utilize a still greater power. For fetishes are employed for all purposes for which magic is supposed to operate.

4. Operation Aided by Suggestion.

The objects employed as fetish are most various. Nothing is too minute or too great, too repulsive or too attractive to be so used. Stones, mountains, water, wind, fire, plants and trees, animals, human beings possessing exceptional characteristics (such as albinos), refuse, parts of animals or of corpses (particularly the eyes)—in short, objects the most insignificant or magnificent are chosen. And there are clear traces that the most diverse regions and ages have witnessed the operation of the institution. It can be traced in ancient Greece, India, China, Egypt, and Babylonia. It is practised in North America, in Oceanica, New Zealand, and Australia. But its garden is in Africa, so much so that in general the religion of Africans is often described as fetishism (see above).

5. Objects Employed and Area of Cult.

Notice should be taken of a superstitious persistence of fetishistic practises and conceptions or

of a reversion to them among civilized nations, especially those which lag in the course of progress. Thus there can be no doubt

6. Cases of Reversion.

that in Roman Catholic countries the peasantry hold their medals, agni dei, and other religious emblems in fetishistic regard. A Russian mujik has been known, when about to commit a crime, to cover the icon in the room so that it might not witness the deed. And within a generation the Bible has been fetishistically employed in Scotland by laying it on the doorstep to keep out witches. GEO. W GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The fundamental work is that of De Brosses, ut sup., and next to that is F. Schultze, *Der Fetichismus*, Leipsic, 1871, Eng. transl., New York, 1885. Consult also: T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, Leipsic, 1860; C. F. Keary, *Outlines of Religion*, chaps. i., iii., London, 1882; R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, Oxford, 1891; G. Allen, *Evolution of Idea of God*, London, 1897; D. G. Brinton, *Religion of Primitive Peoples*, chap. iv., New York, 1897; Miss M. H. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, London, 1898; idem, *West African Studies*, ib. 1899; A. Lang, *Custom and Myth*, pp. 212–242, ib. 1884; idem, *Making of Religion*, chap. viii., ib. 1898; M. Gaston, in *Folk-Lore*, xi., 1900; F. B. Jevons, *Introduction to History of Religion*, chap. xiii., London, 1902; E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, vol. ii., ib. 1903; R. H. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, New York, 1904; A. C. Haddon, *Magic and Fetishism*, London, 1906; G. Belucci, *Il Feticismo primitivo in Italia*, Perugia, 1907.

FEUERBACH, fȯi'er-bāH, **LUDWIG ANDREAS:** German philosopher; b. at Landshut (39 m. n.e. of Munich), Bavaria, July 28, 1804; d. at Rechenberg, near Nuremberg, Sept. 13, 1872. He attended the Gymnasium at Ansbach, and in 1822 entered the University of Heidelberg as a student of theology. Through the lectures of Karl Daub he became interested in Hegelianism, and in 1824 went to Berlin to hear Hegel. He soon gave up theology for philosophy, and in 1828 became docent in philosophy at Erlangen. Promotion to a professorship having been made next to impossible by his *Gedanken über Tod und Unsterblichkeit* (Nuremberg, 1830), in which he disposed of immortality on psychological grounds, he withdrew from the university to devote himself to literary work. He lived in Ansbach till 1836, then at the Castle at Bruckberg till 1860, when he moved to Rechenberg. His radical views made his name a watchword in the late forties, and in 1848–49, by special petition of the students, he lectured in Heidelberg. Accepting the view of Hegel that the Absolute attains consciousness in the human mind, he went one step further and denied the existence of an absolute mind, explaining God as a subjective product of our conscious life. He regarded religion as psychological illusion, a purely subjective process; and God, heaven, and eternal life as desires of the heart realized by the imagination. In short, according to his naturalistic view, God did not make us after his own image at all; rather, we made God after ours; and thus theology becomes a matter of anthropology. Although Feuerbach is the author of that extremely materialistic formula, *Der Mensch ist, was er isst*, "man is what he eats," yet he can scarcely be called a materialist, since he approaches the problem from the psychological side. His principal works are: *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Leipsic, 1841; Eng. transl., *The Essence of Christianity*, by George Eliot, London, 1854); *Das Wesen der Religion* (1845); *Das Theogenie, oder von dem Ursprung der Götter* (1857); *Gott, Freiheit, und Unsterblichkeit vom Standpunkt der Anthropologie* (1866). His collected works in ten volumes appeared at Leipsic 1846–66.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Beyer, *Leben und Geist; Ludwig Feuerbach*, Leipsic, 1873; W Maccall, *The Newest Materialism*, London, 1873; K. Grün, *Ludwig Feuerbach in seinem Briefwechsel und Nachlass*, Leipsic, 1874; W. Bolin, *Ludwig Feuerbach, sein Wirken und seine Zeitgenossen*, Stuttgart, 1891. Consult also the works on the History of Philosophy by Windelband, Ueberweg, and Erdmann.

FEUILLANTS, fu''lyā'ṅ: Roman Catholic congregation taking its name from its place of origin, the Cistercian monastery of Fulium (Feuillans, near Rieux, 25 m. s.w. of Toulouse). It was established as a Reformed body within the Cistercians about 1580 by Jean de la Barrière, a scion of noble family born at St. Céré (60 m. n.e. of Montauban) in 1544; d. 1600. Being appointed abbot *in commendam* of the monastery by a kinsman who had become a convert to Protestantism, De la Barrière led a life of sensuality until, about 1575, twelve years after his appointment, he resolved to enter the Cistercian order. He was deserted by the majority of the monks, however, on account of the rigidity of his regulations, but those who adhered to him adopted a rule still more severe than the Cistercian system. He secured the sanction of Sixtus V., who permitted him (1589) to establish additional monasteries and nunneries. Henry III. of France requested him to send sixty monks to Paris, and founded for them in 1587 a monastery in the Rue St. Honoré, which in the French Revolution gave the name of Feuillants to the royalist party who met within its walls. The successor of De Barrière enjoyed the title of Vicar-General of the Congregation, and secured complete independence of the Cistercians. In 1595 new rules were approved by the pope, modifying the extreme stringency of De Barrière, which had proved injurious to health. The congregation increased rapidly. In the lifetime of their founder the Feuillants possessed, in addition to the mother house, the monastery at Paris, and two at Rome, one at Bordeaux and several in Piedmont, and in the reign of Henry IV., when they received the right of electing their own general, they had between twenty and thirty monasteries both in France and Italy. For purposes of discipline, Urban VIII. divided the congregation (1630) into the French *Congrégation de Notre Dame de Feuillans* and the Italian *Riformati di San Bernardo*, each with its own general and general chapter. The congregation flourished until the Revolution, and among its men of note were Charles de St. Paul and Cardinal Bona.

There were also Feuillant nuns. In 1588 De la Barrière established a nunnery at Montesquiou with fifteen sisters, but their cloister proving too small, they occupied a new convent at Toulouse in 1599. A third nunnery was erected at Poitiers in 1617 and a fourth at Paris in 1622. The rule of the nuns was the same as that of the monks, and they likewise were entirely independent of Cistercian control. Their convents were never numerous,

however, and none of them survived the French Revolution. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Constitutiones* were issued Rome, 1595 and Paris, 1634; the *Privilegia* and the *Compendium privilegiorum et gratiarum*, Paris, 1628. Consult: M. R. A. Henrion, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Mönchsorden*, ed. J. Fehr, Tübingen, 1845; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, v. 401–420; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. 474 sqq ; *KL*, iv. 1470–73; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 131–132.

FIACRE, fī-ā'cr (FIACHRACH), SAINT: Irish hermit; b. in Ireland c. 610; d. at Breuil, near Meaux (27 m. e.n.e. of Paris), c. 670. Seeking seclusion he went to France with a few companions and erected a small monastery in the woods near Meaux, and also a small dwelling-house, in which he received his guests. No woman was allowed to enter his monastery. As early as the ninth century he had acquired great fame as a worker of miracles. He was thought to have effected wonderful cures merely by the laying on of his hands; and pilgrims flocked to his shrine, believing that his remains still possessed healing power. The shrine containing his remains, which was removed to the cathedral of Meaux in 1568, has been opened frequently, lastly in 1637, when some of the vertebræ were given to Cardinal Richelieu. Fiacre is the patron saint of gardeners and is commemorated on Aug. 30. In France his name has been perpetuated by the fact that in 1640 a merchant in Paris who had carriages to rent placed the image of St. Fiacre over his door and called the establishment the *Hôtel de St. Fiacre ;* in course of time his carriages came to be known as "*Fiacres*," and the word passed into the French language as the common term for a public carriage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *ASB*, Aug., vi. 598–620; *ASM*, sæc. II., 598–602; A. J. Ansart, *Hist. de S. Fiacre*, Paris, 1782; Ricard, *La Vie et les miracles de S. Fiacre*, ib. 1865 (founded on the *ASB*); Grandtrait, *Vie de S. Fiacre*, Meaux, 1881; *DCB*, ii. 509–510.

FICHTE, fĭH'te, IMMANUEL HERMANN: German philosopher, son of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (q.v.); b. at Jena July 18, 1797; d. at Stuttgart Aug. 8, 1879. He was for many years a gymnasial professor at Saarbrücken and Düsseldorf, and then professor of philosophy at Bonn 1836–42 (ordinary professor after 1840), and at Tübingen 1842–63. In 1863 he retired from the university and soon afterward settled in Stuttgart. He edited his father's works, founded and edited the *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie*, and was a prolific writer on philosophy. In metaphysics his position was that of a mediator between the two conflicting views represented by Hegel and Herbart, and, too, in the interest of theology. His great aim was to secure a philosophical basis for the personality of God. Taking the monadology of Leibnitz as the model of a system embracing unity in plurality and plurality in unity, he sought to fuse extreme spiritualistic monism and extreme pluralistic realism into what he called concrete theism. The more important of his independent works are, *Beiträge zur Charakteristik der neuern Philosophie* (Sulzbach, 1829; 2d ed., completely rewritten, 1841); *Religion und Philosophie* (Heidelberg, 1834); *Die speculative Theologie* (3 parts, 1846); *System der Ethik* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1850–53); *Anthropologie* (1856); *Vermischte Schriften* (2 vols., 1869); *Die theistische Weltansicht und ihre Berechtigung* (1873); and *Der neuere Spiritualismus* (1878).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Eucken, in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, cx (1897), 1–7; E. von Hartmann, *Geschichte der Metaphysik*, ii. 367–379, Leipsic, 1900.

FICHTE, JOHANN GOTTLIEB: German philosopher; b. at Rammenau, near Bischofswerda (20 m. e.n.e. of Dresden), May 19, 1762; d. in Berlin Jan. 27, 1814. The son of a poor weaver, he attended the public school at Meissen and the charity school at Schulpforta. Later he studied at the universities of Jena and Leipsic. For a number of years he was private tutor in Leipsic, Zurich, and Warsaw. In 1792 he went to Königsberg to hear Kant, whose transcendentalism he had now adopted. Here he wrote in four weeks his *Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung* (Königsberg, 1792), which appeared anonymously and was taken for a work of Kant's. When the authorship of the book became known, Fichte's reputation as a philosopher was made. After a short residence in Zurich, he entered upon a professorship in philosophy at Jena in 1794. Here he published *Grundlage der gesammten Wissenschaftslehre* (Jena, 1794), his new system of philosophy; *Die Bestimmung des Gelehrten* (1794); *Grundlage des Naturrechts* (2 parts, 1796; Eng. transl., *The Science of Rights*, Philadelphia, 1869, new ed., London, 1889); and *System der Sittenlehre* (1798; Eng. transl., *The Science of Ethics*, London, 1897). Both his writings and lectures made a deep impression; but they also created a suspicion of atheism. In 1798 he published a little essay entitled *Ueber den Grund unsers Glaubens an eine göttliche Weltregierung*, in which he declared that the moral order of the world is God, and that there is no other God. Despite Fichte's strenuous denial of the charge of atheism he was dismissed from the university a few months later. In June, 1799 he went to Berlin where, except for a summer at Erlangen in 1805 and a visit to Königsberg in 1806–07, he spent the remainder of his life. In this period falls *Die Bestimmung des Menschen* (Berlin, 1800); *Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters* (1806), lectures delivered at Berlin in 1804–05; *Ueber das Wesen des Gelehrten* (1806), lectures delivered at the University of Erlangen in 1805; and *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1808), a famous course of lectures delivered at Berlin in the winter of 1807–08. He took a prominent part in the establishment of the University of Berlin and was professor of philosophy in the new institution from its opening (1810) till his death. The fruits of his academic work there will be found in *Die Wissenschaftslehre in ihrem allgemeinen Umrisse* (1810; Eng. transl., *The Science of Knowledge*, Philadelphia, 1868, new ed., London, 1889); and in *Die Thatsachen des Bewusstseins* (Tübingen, 1817). Fichte's popular writing will be found in English translation in *The Popular Works of J. G. Fichte* (2 vols., London, 1848–49; 4th ed., 2 vols., 1889), including, *The Vocation of the Scholar, The Nature of the Scholar, The Vocation of Man, Characteristics of the Present Age, The Way*

towards the Blessed Life, and *Outlines of the Doctrine of Knowledge*. Fichte's *Sämmtliche Werke* (8 vols., Berlin, 1845–46) were edited by his son I. H. Fichte.

Fichte derives all philosophical knowledge from the one principle of the consciousness of the indivisible Ego, which posits its own being in distinction from a divisible non-Ego. His ethics is based on the absolute freedom of this Ego as an intelligent being. Religion is by him reduced to faith in the moral order of the universe, and this leads to the positive assertion of immortality on the ground that no ego which by the act of consciousness has become real can ever perish. While Fichte's subjectivism was soon superseded by other metaphysical views, his influence as a moral reformer is felt in Germany even to-day. See IDEALISM; RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY OF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The authoritative life is by his son, I. H. Fichte, *J. G. Fichte's Leben und litterarischer Briefwechsel*, Leipsic, 1862. Other accounts are by C. Köstlin, Tübingen, 1862; L. Noack, Leipsic, 1862 (important); O. Pfleiderer, Stuttgart, 1877; A. Spir, Leipsic, 1879; W. Smith, in the *Popular Works*, ut sup.; *ADB*, vi. 761–771

On various phases of his philosophy consult: W Busse, *Fichte und seine Beziehung zur Gegenwart des deutschen Volkes*, Halle, 1848–49; A. Schopenhauer, *Aus A. Schopenhauer's . Nachlass*, ed. J. Frauenstadt, pp. 161–189, Leipsic, 1864; F. Bowen, *Modern Philosophy*, pp. 310–326, New York, 1877; F. Zimmer, *J G. Fichte's Religionsphilosophie*, Berlin, 1878; A. Seth, *The Development from Kant to Hegel*, London, 1882; C. C. Everett, *Fichte's Science of Knowledge*, Chicago, 1884; Anna B. Thompson, *The Unity of Fichte's Doctrine of Knowledge*, Boston, 1895; I. F. Brown, *Doctrine of Freedom of the Will in Fichte's Philosophy*, Richmond, Ind., 1900; C. Ivanoff, *Die Ethik J. G. Fichte*, Leipsic, 1900; H. Lindau, *J. G. Fichte und der neuere Socialismus*, Berlin, 1900; Ellen B. Talbot, *The Fundamental Principles of Fichte's Philosophy*, New York, 1906; M. Raich, *Fichte, seine Ethik, und seine Stelle zum Problem des Individualismus*, Tübingen, 1907.

FICINUS, MARSILIUS (MARSILIO FICINO): Italian scholar and Platonic philosopher; b. at Florence Oct. 19, 1433; d. at Careggi (3 m. n. of Florence) Oct. 1, 1499. He was the son of a physician of Cosmo de' Medici and had the patronage of the Medici's during three generations. He studied under Gemistos Plethon (q.v.), enjoyed the intercourse of the leaders of the Renaissance, became a teacher of philosophy and the head of the Platonic Academy established in Florence by Cosmo de' Medici, and numbered among his pupils such men as Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, and Sixtus IV Convinced of the essential identity of Platonic philosophy and religion, since the truth and wisdom sought by the philosopher are only the truth and wisdom of God, he took orders in 1473, preached in Florence, and was promoted to a canonry in the cathedral. Through his Latin translations from Plato and the Neoplatonists, Plotinus, Jamblichus, and Proclus, he gave a tremendous impetus to Platonic studies in Italy, and thus influeneed greatly the development of European philosophy. His most important original work is, *Theologia Platonica de animorum immortalitate* (Florence, 1482). The first complete edition of his works was published at Basel in two volumes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. G. Schellhorn, *De vita, moribus et scriptis Marsilii Ficini*, in vol. i. of *Amœnitates*, Leipsic, 1730; K. Sieveking, *Geschichte der platonischen Akademie zu Florenz*, Göttingen, 1812; *Archivio storico Italiano*, 1859 (by L. Galeotti) and 1865 (by A. Conti).

FICKER, PAUL GERHARD: German Protestant; b. at Thonberg, a suburb of Leipsic, Feb. 8, 1865. He studied at the University of Leipsic (1884–89; Ph.D., 1889), the theological seminary of St. Pauli in the same city (1887–89), and the German Archeological Institute, Rome (1889–90). After being assistant pastor and pastor at Sohland-an-der-Spree, in 1892, he became privat-docent at Halle in 1893. From 1903 to 1906 he was associate professor of church history at that university, and since 1906 has been full professor at Kiel. In 1900–01 he made an archeological tour of Italy, Tunis, Spain, and France. He belongs to the historical school and has written *Der Mitralis des Sicardus nach seiner Bedeutung für die Ikonographie des Mittelalters* (Leipsic, 1889); *Studien zur Hippolytfrage* (1893); *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus* (1897); *Das ausgehende Mittelalter und sein Verhältnis zur Reformation* (1903); *Die Petrusakten, Beiträge zu ihrem Verständnis* (1903); *Bonifatius, der "Apostel der Deutschen"* (1905); and *Amphilohiana*, part i. (1906), besides contributing a translation of the Acts of Peter to Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1904).

FICKER, PAUL JOHANNES: German Protestant; b. at Leipsic-Neureudnitz Nov. 12, 1861. He studied at Leipsic (1880–84; Ph.D., 1886) and the theological seminary of St. Paul's there (1884–86), and after travels in Italy and Spain became privat-docent for church history at Halle in 1890. In 1892 he was appointed associate professor of the same subject at Strasburg and full professor in 1900. He has edited the *Archäologische Studien zum christlichen Altertum und Mittelalter* (1897–99) and *Studien über christliche Denkmäler* (since 1902), and has written *Die Darstellung der Apostel in der altchristlichen Kunst* (Leipsic, 1887); *Die altchristlichen Bildwerke im christlichen Museum des Laterans* (1889); *Die Konfutation des Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses* (1891); *Handschriftenproben des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts nach Strassburger Originalen* (2 vols., Strasburg, 1902–05; in collaboration with O. Winckelmann); and *Evangelischer Kirchenbau* (Leipsic, 1905).

FIDANZA, GIOVANNI DI. See BONAVENTURA.

FIDDES, fid'dez, RICHARD: English clergyman and author; b. at Hunmanby (34 m. e.n.e. of York), Yorkshire, 1671; d. at Putney (7 m. w.s.w. of St. Paul's, London) 1725. He studied at Oxford, first at Corpus Christi College (1687–90), then at University College (B.A., 1691; B.D., 1713; D.D., 1718), took holy orders in 1694, and in 1696 received the rectory of Halsham, in Holderness. On account of a bad throat he got leave of non-residence, and in 1712 settled in London as a man of letters. His principal works are, *A Body of Divinity* (2 vols., London, 1718–20); *Fifty-two practical Discourses* (1820); *A General Treatise of Morality* (1724), in which he attacks Mandeville; and *A Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (1724), for which, on account of his disparagement of the Reformation, he was accused of popery, particularly by the assailants of Atterbury.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. The one early life is by Thomas Birch in *A New and General Biographical Dictionary*, London,

1761–67 (inaccurate). Corrections of this must be made by reference to the prefaces and dedications of his works (cf. *DNB*, xviii. 397–398).

FIDELIS, SAINT (MARKUS ROY): German Capuchin; b. at Sigmaringen (30 m. n.e. of Constance) 1577; d. at Seewis (32 m. s.e. of Schwyz) Apr. 24, 1622. He received a thorough education and studied law at Freiburg until 1603, after which he traveled extensively, and in 1611 settled at Ensisheim as a lawyer. In the same year, he entered the Capuchin Order under the name of Pater Fidelis; after his ordination he studied theology at the monasteries of Constance and Frauenfeld. He then became parish priest successively at Rheinfelden and Freiburg, and finally guardian in the monastery of Feldkirch. When the Austrians and Spaniards seized a portion of the Swiss territories in 1620 and sought to reconvert them to the Roman Catholic Church, the Congregation of the Propaganda placed Fidelis at the head of the Rhetian mission. On the day of his death he preached in the church of Seewis under the protection of a detachment of soldiers, whereupon the desperate peasants captured the church and routed the troops, murdering the fleeing preacher in the street. His corpse was first buried at Seewis and later at Chur, while his head was interred at Feldkirch. He was canonized by Benedict XIV. on June 29, 1746. (E. Blösch†.)

Bibliography: Sources for a life are in H. Murer, *Helvetia sancta*, pp. 431 sqq., Lucerne, 1648; F. Sprecher von Berneck, *Hist. motuum et bellorum*, Geneva, 1629, Germ. transl., i. 334, Chur, 1856. The best modern life is in A. Butler, *Lives of the Fathers*, i. 494–496, London, 1857; consult also *KL*, iv. 1482–85.

FIEF, ECCLESIASTICAL: A term used sometimes as equivalent to Benefice (q.v.), but more properly designating an estate belonging to the Church and conferred by feudal tenure. Military service was included in the obligations of a true fief, even when held by a cleric—but in this case, as the canons forbade him to bear arms, he was allowed to provide a substitute. The practise of granting church lands attained such proportions during the Middle Ages that Pius V., in 1567, prohibited any further grants, providing for the immediate incorporation with the papal *camera* of any fiefs that fell in. On this principle Clement VIII. incorporated the duchy of Ferrara with the States of the Church in 1598, and Urban VIII. did the same with Urbino, Castro, and Ronciglione. Famous instances of countries held by their rulers as vassals of the pope were Aragon (1208), England (1213), the island of Sardinia (1295), Naples and Sicily down to the second half of the eighteenth century. (O. Mejer†.)

Bibliography: G. A. Jenichen, *Thesaurus juris feudalis*, i. 990, Frankfort, 1750; G. L. Böhmer, *Observationes juris feudalis*, no. 7, Göttingen, 1784; *Rechtslexikon*, vi. 386 sqq., Leipsic, 1845; *KL*, vii. 597–600.

FIELD, FREDERICK: Church of England; b. in London July 20, 1801; d. at Norwich Apr. 19, 1885. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1823), and from 1824 to 1843 was fellow of his college. He was ordained priest in 1828, and was rector of Reepham, Norfolk, 1842–63, resigning that he might be able to devote himself entirely to his edition of the fragments of Origen's *Hexapla*, a work the erudition of which is universally recognized. He was elected an honorary fellow of Trinity College in 1875 and was a member of the British Old Testament Revision Company. In theology he avoided both the Evangelical and ritualistic extremes. He edited the Greek text of Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew (3 vols., Cambridge, 1839) and on all the Pauline Epistles (7 vols., Oxford, 1849–62); Isaac Barrow's *Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy* (London, 1851); J. E. Grabe's text of the Septuagint (Oxford, 1859); and *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt* (2 vols., 1867–74); and wrote *Otium Norvicense* (3 parts, 1864–86; the third part, *Notes on select Passages of the Greek Testament*, reprinted with additions by the author and edited by A. M. Knight, 1897). He also collaborated on Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*.

Bibliography: His autobiography is in the preface to his edition of Origen's *Hexapla*. Consult W. Aldis Wright, in *Cambridge Review*, May 6, 1885; *DNB*, xviii. 402–404.

FIELD, HENRY MARTYN: Presbyterian; b. at Stockbridge, Mass., Apr. 3, 1822; d. there Dec. 29, 1907 He studied at Williams College (B.A., 1838), East Windsor Hill (now Hartford) Theological Seminary (1838–41), and Yale Divinity School (1841–42), and was pastor at St. Louis, Mo. (1842–47), and West Springfield, Mass (1850–54). From 1854 to 1900 he was editor and proprietor of *The Evangelist*, a Presbyterian weekly, published in New York City. His travel-sketches enjoyed great repute. His published works include: *The Irish Confederates, and the Rebellion of 1798* (New York, 1851); *Summer Pictures from Copenhagen to Venice* (1859); *History of the Atlantic Telegraph* (1866); *From the Lakes of Killarney to the Golden Horn* (1876); *From Egypt to Japan* (1877); *On the Desert; with Review of Events in Egypt* (1883); *Among the Holy Hills* (1884); *The Greek Islands and Turkey after the War* (1885); *Blood Thicker than Water: A Few Days among our Southern Brethren* (1886); *Old and New Spain* (1888); *Gibraltar* (1889); *Bright Skies and Dark Shadows* (1890); *The Story of the Atlantic Telegraph* (1893); and *The Life of David Dudley Field* (1898).

FIELD, RICHARD: English clergyman and theological writer; b. at Hemel Hempstead (23 m. n.w. of London), Hertfordshire, Oct. 15, 1561; d. at Windsor (23 m. w. of London) Nov. 21, 1616. He attended the Berkhampstead school and in 1577 entered Oxford, studying successively at Magdalen College, Magdalen Hall, and Queen's College (B.A., 1581; M.A., 1584; B.D., 1592; D.D., 1596). As a lecturer (1584–91) at Magdalen Hall he made himself famous for his knowledge of divinity and his ability as a disputant. In 1594 he became divinity lecturer at Lincoln's Inn, and soon afterward rector at Burghclere, Hampshire. In 1598 he became a chaplain in ordinary to Queen Elizabeth, in 1604 canon at Windsor, and in 1609 dean of Gloucester. He was also chaplain to James I., who sent him to the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 and called him to Oxford in 1605 to take part in the Divinity Act. James held Field in high esteem, delighted to discuss points of theology

with him, and intended to raise him to the see of Oxford. On hearing Field preach for the first time, the king had exclaimed, "This is a *field* for God to dwell in." Thomas Fuller called him "that learned divine whose memory smelleth like a *field* which the Lord hath blessed." Field's fame now rests upon his work entitled, *Of the Church, Five Books* (2 vols., London, 1606–10; 2d. ed., Oxford, 1628; modern ed., 4 vols., Cambridge, 1847–52), which has taken its place with Hooker's *Polity* as one of the grandest monuments of polemical divinity in the English language.

Bibliography: N. Field, *Some Short Memorials concerning the Life . . . of R. Field*, published by J. Le Neve, London, 1716–17; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, ii. 181–186, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; *DNB*, xviii. 411–412.

FIELD SERVICE (Germ. *Felddiakonie*): Service rendered to combatants on the field of war, prompted by the spirit of love and in its origin of the nature of Christian ministration, but influenced also by the spirit of secular humanitarianism. See War.

FIFTH MONARCHY MEN: Millenarian enthusiasts of the Commonwealth period in England who believed and taught that Christ was setting up "a fifth monarchy in the world," laid claim to the gift of prophecy, and wished to destroy all anti-Christian "forms" (e.g., an Established Church). Early leaders were Vavasor Powell (d. 1670), a nonconformist minister, who with all his eccentricities seems to have been a man of ability and worth, and Christopher Feake (not heard of after 1660), an irregular preacher. They were bitterly opposed to Cromwell, whom Feake called "the most dissembling and perjured villain in the world." Both were imprisoned by Cromwell, but were leniently treated and they were violent only in word. In Apr., 1657, one Thomas Venner, a cooper, headed a plot for a rising of Fifth Monarchy men in London. It was discovered and Venner was kept in prison till 1659. On Jan. 6, 1661, he set out with a considerable following to overthrow the government. They marched the streets with the cry "Long live King Jesus," until they were dispersed by the guards. Three days later the remnant of them was captured. Venner was hanged and quartered on Jan. 19.

Bibliography: D. Neal, *Lives of the Puritans*, ii. 176–220 of Harper's ed., New York, n.d.; E. Rogers, *Some Account of the "Life and Opinions" of a Fifth Monarchy Man, . . . from the Writings of John Rogers*, London, 1867; J. Stoughton, *Religion in England*, ii. 57–69, ib. 1881; *DNB*, xviii. 271–272 (Life of Feake), xlvi. 249–252 (Life of Powell), lviii. 212 (Life of Venner).

FIJI or VITI ISLANDS: A group of two hundred and fifty islands in the Southern Pacific, comprising an area of nearly 8,000 square miles. The two largest islands are Vanua Levu ("Great Land"), which is one hundred miles long and has an area of 2,600 square miles, and Viti Levu ("Great Viti or Fiji"), which is ninety by fifty miles and 4,250 square miles in extent. Some eighty of the islands are inhabited. They are of coral and volcanic formation, and have a pleasant climate. The islands were discovered by Tasman in 1643, and were visited by Bligh in 1789, and by Wilson in 1797. The Fijians combine characteristics of the Melanesian and Polynesian types. Physically they are an athletic, well-formed race, and mentally they are far above the Papuans. The population was divided up into tribes, and ruled by kings, until 1874, when the islands were annexed to Great Britain. The more powerful chiefs voluntarily proposed the cession, and signed articles to that effect in Oct., 1874. When Sir Arthur Gordon, the first English governor, arrived in 1875 a pestilence had carried off one-third of the population, and the islands were in a state of great poverty. Under English rule the yearly revenues have increased from £16,000 in 1875 to £138,167 in 1903, a code of laws has been adopted, and courts have been established for the administration of justice. The census of 1901 gave the population as 120,124, of whom 2,459 were Europeans, 94,397 Fijians, 17,105 Indians, etc. The steady extinction of the native element is shown by the number of births and deaths in 1903, 3,244 and 5,725 respectively. The chief productions are yams, sugar-cane, tea, maize, copra, and bananas.

Description and History.

The native religion included a belief in a future state and two classes of gods. Witchcraft was widely practised and taboo was in full force. Polygamy prevailed and female infanticide was practised. The wife or wives were strangled at the death of the husband. Life was cheap, the kings sacrificing men at the launching of a new canoe, the inception of a campaign, or the erection of a house. The islands were the headquarters of cannibalism although there were some natives whom the missionaries found averse to eating human flesh. The victims of war and shipwrecked sailors were commonly eaten, and human flesh was pronounced more palatable than pork. A chief registered the number of bodies he ate by stones and one of the missionaries counted 872 of these stones.

Native Religion.

The first missionaries were Messrs. Cross and Cargill, who went to Fiji in 1835 from the Friendly Islands. In 1839 they were reinforced by Messrs. Lythe and Hunt, and by Mr. Williams and others in 1840. The work was carried on amidst discouragements and perils during the first years, but was rewarded with extensive revivals, and the gradual conversion of nearly the whole population. Thokombau, the leading chief, after resisting the missionaries for a number of years, was baptized in Jan., 1857, giving up all his wives but one. The language was reduced to writing; and the Bible, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, a Fijian-English dictionary (by Rev. David Hazlewood), and other books, have been printed in the native language. Cannibalism has been given up except among a few remote tribes and polygamy no longer prevails. Churches are well attended. Many natives have proved faithful preachers and catechists. The Sabbath is observed and family-worship is held in many families. The dark side of the picture is furnished by the constant decrease in the native population,

Missions.

their proneness to idleness, and the contaminating contact with the baser whites.

The English Wesleyans have been the only Protestants laboring in Fiji until recently the Seventh-day Adventists have entered the field. The Wesleyan churches in 1905 were divided into 12 circuits with 799 organized congregations, 17 European (or Australian) missionaries, 80 native ministers, 75 native catechists, 1,004 native teachers, 3,411 native local preachers, and 5,999 native class leaders, 35,456 native church members, and 5,499 on probation. There were 1,163 Sunday Schools and 28,403 native teachers and scholars, 1,151 day schools with 18,130 scholars. The "attendants at public worship" numbered 86,005. The chief institution of higher learning is Navuloa where ministers as well as teachers are trained. There are also high schools for boys and girls. In 1905, 22 new church buildings were put up in the single circuit of Ra.

The Roman Catholics are actively engaged on the islands and in 1903 had 30 European priests and 20 nuns, 71 churches and chapels, 163 schools, and 1,880 scholars. All the schools on the islands are supported by the Wesleyans and Catholics, except two, which receive subsidies from the government. A large missionary problem is offered by the laborers transported from British India and numbering in 1905 26,000 with only two missionaries laboring among them. The Fijians also send out foreign missionaries trained at Navuloa.

D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, and J. Calvert, *Missionary Labours among the Cannibals*, issued in one vol., London, 1870 (interesting and exhaustive); L. Forbes, *Two Years in Fiji*, ib. 1875; Miss C. F. G. Cumming, *At Home in Fiji*, 2 vols., ib. 1881; A. H. Johnston, *Camping among the Cannibals*, ib. 1884; W Reed, *Recent Wanderings in Fiji*, ib. 1888; J. W. Alexander, *The Islands of the Pacific; a Sketch of Missions in the Pacific*, pp. 390-408, New York, 1895; *Statesman's Year Book*, 1905; *Report of the Methodist Missionary Society of Australia for 1905*, Sydney, 1906.

FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY: A dispute which concerns one of the principal differences between the Eastern and the Western Churches, arising from the fact that the latter adds the word *filioque* to its creed. The Apostles' Creed has simply, "And in the Holy Ghost," to which the Constantinopolitan Creed (q.v.) added, "Who proceedeth from the father." There the Greek Church stopped, while the Latin Church, without the sanction of an ecumenical council, or even consultation with the Greek Church, added, "and the Son" (*filioque*). The Greek Church protested as soon as it discovered the addition; and attempts which have since been made to reestablish union between the two churches have been wrecked chiefly on this word.

The addition is met with for the first time in the acts of the Third Council of Toledo (589), in opposition to Arianism. From Spain it spread into France, where it seems to have been generally adopted at the time of Charlemagne. The Councils of Constantinople (681) and the Second Nicæa (787) did not notice it. In 809 two monks from the court of Charlemagne made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and were accused of heresy by the hermits of Mount Olivet for their use of *filioque*. Charlemagne felt provoked; and the council which he convoked at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen, 809) sanctioned the use of the addition.

Pope Leo III., whose confirmation of the decision of the council was asked for by Charlemagne, refused formally to incorporate the *filioque* in the creed, though he admitted the justness and soundness of its doctrinal bearing; and this attitude of cautious reserve the pope endeavored to maintain so far as he could under the pressure of the steadily growing impatience of the East and the all but universal practise of the West. Toward the close of the century, however, this attitude became impossible. Photius, in his encyclical letter, emphasizes the *filioque* as one of the gravest errors of the pope; and the Council of Constantinople anathematized it. Political circumstances compelled the pope to take up the challenge. Nevertheless, the first time a pope actually used the addition to the creed was in 1014, by Benedict VIII., at the crowning of Henry II. From that moment the pope himself appears as the defender of the practise of the Western Church, and at the Council of Ferrara-Florence he seemed to have entirely forgotten that, at least historically, there was a flaw in his argument.

The doctrine in whose statement the word *filioque* was destined to play so prominent a part is called the "Procession of the Holy Ghost." The term comes from John xv. 26, in which Christ speaks of the spirit of truth who "proceedeth from the Father." Inasmuch as nothing is said in this passage or in any other of the "double procession," i.e., from *both* the Father and the Son, the Greek Church holds to the single procession, and defends its position not only by an appeal to the text of Scripture and to the original form of the Nicene Creed, but also to the "monarchy" (Gk. *monarchia*) of the Father as the sole fountain, root, and cause of the deity. It distinguishes sharply between the eternal metaphysical *procession* of the Spirit from the Father alone, and the temporal *mission* of the Spirit by the Father and the Son (John xiv. 26, xvi. 7). The former belongs to the trinity of essence, the latter to the trinity of revelation, and begins with the Day of Pentecost. The Latin Church defends the double procession on the grounds of the double mission of the Spirit and the essential unity of the Son with the Father; so that, if the Spirit proceed from the essence of the Father, he must also proceed from the essence of the Son, because they have the same essence. The Greek patriarchs declined to attend the Vatican Council of 1870, on the ground of the heresy of the Latin Church upon this point.

A compromise was suggested from the writings of John of Damascus, to say that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, *through the Son*. This was accepted by the conference held in Bonn (Aug., 1875) between the Old Catholics, Orientals, and Anglo-Catholics, in which the *filioque* was surrendered as an unauthorized addition to the Creed. See CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Besides the literature on the Constantinopolitan Creed, consult J. G. Walch, *Historia controversiæ de processione Spiritus Sancti*, Jena, 1751;

J. M. Neale, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, i. 1093, London, 1850; E. S. Foulkes, *Historical Account of the Addition of Filioque to the Creed*, London, 1867; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 142 sqq., ib. 1869; K. R. Hagenbach, *Hist. of Christian Doctrines*, ii. 205, Edinburgh, 1880; C. Adams, "Filioque," ib. 1884; G. B. Howard, *Schism between the Oriental and the Western Churches*, ib. 1892; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 687 sqq.

FINAN, SAINT: Second bishop of Lindisfarne, where he died Aug. 31, 661. He was a monk of Iona, succeeded Aidan (q.v.) at Lindisfarne 652, and was ordained in Scotland. Aided by Oswy, king of Northumbria (642–670) and brother of St. Oswald (q.v.), he extended his missionary labors, and baptized Peada, king of Mercia, and Sigbert, king of the East Saxons. He consecrated one of his priests, Diuma, as first bishop of Mercia, Cedd (q.v.) as bishop of Essex, and Cellach as Diuma's successor. He adhered to the old British date for Easter.

Bibliography: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 17, 21, 22, 25–27; A. P. Forbes, *Kalendar of Scottish Saints*, pp. 348–349, Edinburgh, 1872.

FINDLAY, GEORGE GILLANDERS: English Methodist; b. at Welshpool (18 m. s.w. of Shrewsbury), Montgomeryshire, Wales, Jan. 3, 1849. He studied at Wesley College, Sheffield (1865–67), Richmond Theological College (1869–70), and London University (B.A., 1868). He was assistant tutor at Headingley College 1870–74; classical tutor at Richmond Theological College 1874–81; and was appointed tutor in New Testament exegesis and classics in the Headingley branch of the Wesleyan Theological Institution, Leeds, 1881. He has prepared the sections on the Epistles to the Galatians (1888) and Ephesians (1892) in *The Expositor's Bible* (London); *Epistles of the Apostle Paul: Their Origin and Contents* (1892); *Epistles of Paul the Apostle* (1893); *Church of Christ in the New Testament* (1893); *Christian Doctrine and Morals* (1894); *The Books of the Prophets in their Historical Succession* (3 vols., 1896–1907); *Thessalonians* in *The Cambridge Greek Testament* (Cambridge, 1897); and *The Things Above* (London, 1902). He edited A. M. Hillier's translation of L. A. Sabatier's *L'Apôtre Paul* (London, 1891).

FINLAND.

Introduction and Progress of Christianity (§ 1).
The Reformation (§ 2).
Bishops Juusten and Erici (§ 3).
The Seventeenth Century (§ 4).
The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries (§ 5).
Present Conditions (§ 6).

Finland is at present a grand duchy of Russia, bounded on the north by Norway, on the east by the Russian governments of Archangel and Olonetz, on the southeast and south by Lake Ladoga, the government of St. Petersburg, and the Gulf of Finland, on the west by the Gulf of Bothnia and by Sweden; area 144,000 square miles; population (1903) 2,850,000; capital Helsingfors. With the conversion to Christianity (see below) the country came under Swedish government, and so remained till 1809, when it was definitely ceded to Russia. The great majority of the people are Lutherans (98 per cent in 1900, when the number of Greek Orthodox was 46,466 and of Roman Catholics 755).

It is agreed that the Finns, a branch of the Ural-Altaic race, originated on the banks of the Yenisei River or Lake Baikal in Asia, and moved westward in the course of centuries. The isolated position of Finland in the north, between the Gulfs of Bothnia and Finland, explains the fact that it is not mentioned in history till comparatively late. It came into contact with the rest of Europe through Sweden as well as by connections with the apostolic see in Rome. About 1157, King Eric IX. of Sweden, whose coasts were harassed by Finnish pirates, undertook a war of conversion against Finland. An Englishman, Henry by name, accompanied him as missionary. The Finns were forced to accept baptism and Christianity, and at the same time had to submit to foreign rule. Henry remained in the country, but soon died as martyr. A new crusade from Sweden was undertaken in 1249 by Jarl Birger, and a third followed in 1290, under the leadership of Torkel Knutson. The Christian Church began to take root in Finland. The bishop's seat was finally fixed in Abo, where it is still, and the entire spiritual and secular administration centered there. It was the bishop's task to organize the newly founded Church, to baptize, build churches, and accustom the barbarous people to Christian manners. The bishopric of Abo was filled by a number of efficient and powerful men, who, in the beginning, were Swedes; the first Finnish bishop was Magnus I. (1291–1308). Other prominent bishops were Hemming (1338–66), Magnus Olai Tavast (1412–50), Conrad Bitze (1460–1489), and Magnus Stjernkors (1489–1500). They possessed the best scientific culture of their time, having studied in Paris, Leipsic, and Bologna. The bishops of Finland had an influential position, not only in the Church, but also in politics. Swedish rulers took pains to win them for their cause. A supreme court, instituted by King Eric of Pomerania, counted the bishop and several priests among its members. The bishop was elected by the cathedral chapter, but the election had to be confirmed by the pope. He had to swear allegiance to the pope, to the Church, and to the king of Sweden. The chapter consisted originally of four and later of ten canons. In 1340 there was instituted the office of cathedral provost, and in 1389 an archdeaconry. Apart from the cathedral chapter, so-called country-provosts were appointed who were entrusted with the ecclesiastical supervision of certain districts, called provostships. Before the Reformation, the Church of Finland attained its highest development under Bishop Magnus Tavast (1412–50). The standard of morality among the priests was generally on a level with conditions in other countries. The law of celibacy, introduced in Sweden in 1248, was valid also for Finland, at least nominally. From the oldest times the people paid tithes. Now and then disputes occurred between the secular clergy and the orders, and a bull, issued in 1395 by Boniface IX., accurately defined the activity of the monks. Mendicant friars appeared in Finland as early as 1250. There were six monasteries—two of the Dominicans

1. Introduction and Progress of Christianity.

in Abo and Viborg, three of the Franciscans in Abo, Raumo and Köker, and one of the Brigittines in Nadindal. The brotherhoods of the Middle Ages also found admission into Finland; fifteen guilds are known to have existed. There was no higher institution of learning. The land suffered much, as it was always a bone of contention between Sweden and Russia. For centuries there were continual battles between the different tribes in the interior. The spiritual culture of the people was neglected in these turbulent times, especially since the Roman Church was never interested in the real education of the people. At the Synod of Söderköping in Sweden (1441) it was decided that the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, and the Creed should be translated into the mother tongue. Bishop Tavast participated, and it may be assumed that these decisions applied also to Finland. Before 1500 there were 120 churches in Finland. In 1504 the Swedish government ordered the building of new churches since the congregations were so large that some people lived ninety miles from a church. No books for the use of the people have been preserved from the Middle Ages, but a *Missale Aboense*, published in 1483 at the instance of Bishop Bitze, for the use of the cathedral of Abo, is known, and also a *Manuale Aboense* (1522) for the use of the Finnish Church.

2. The Reformation.

In consequence of the connection of Finland with Sweden, the Reformation took the same course in both countries. The first herald of the Reformation in Finland was Peter Särkilahti, who had studied under Luther and Melanchthon. In 1524 he returned to his native country and began to preach the new doctrine. Owing to the isolated position of Finland, the people were not prepared for it and the Roman Church had a larger field of usefulness than in Germany. The first Evangelical bishop of Finland was Martin Skytte, a quiet and humble man. His activity was not revolutionary. The real Reformer of Finland was Michael Agricola, son of a poor fisher of Perna, who received his rudimentary education in the school of Abo and studied in Wittenberg. There he adopted the cause of the Reformation. Like the other Reformers, he immediately undertook a translation of the Bible in order to gain a firm basis for his work. In 1543 he published a primer and soon afterward a catechism, in 1544 a book of prayer. The translation of the New Testament, which he had begun in Wittenberg, appeared in 1548. In the following year he published a manual on baptism and in 1551 the continuation of his translation of the Bible, the Psalms and part of the Prophets. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi followed in 1552. Agricola died in 1554. He is gratefully remembered and highly esteemed by the Finnish people as the Reformer of Finland and the father of Finnish literature. The Reformation was completed by Jacob Finno. Agricola gave the Finns the New Testament, Finno taught them to sing the Psalms. His psalm-book was published in 1583 at Stockholm. The only copy in existence is defective and is in the library of Upsala. On the whole the Reformatory movement took a quiet course, without great frictions. But a sect originated, tracing its origin to a certain Zechariah, a Jew of Novgorod, which advocated the celebration of the seventh day as Sabbath and obedience to the law of Moses. It was condemned at a council in 1504.

3. Bishops Juusten and Erici.

Under King Gustavus Vasa, Finland was divided into two bishoprics. The eastern part of the country was constituted a separate diocese with Viborg as cathedral town. The first bishop there was Paul Juusten who also had studied at Wittenberg. The church forms in Finland were modeled in general after the mother country Sweden. A church order was issued in 1571. Until that time there were no general church regulations. Some of the ecclesiastical positions were filled immediately by the king, others by the bishop and chapter. The men who influenced most deeply the culture of Finland after the introduction of the Reformation were Bishop Paul Juusten and Bishop Ericus Erici. Juusten became bishop in Viborg in 1554, and in Abo in 1563. He wrote the *Capita rerum synodicarum* which formed the basis of discussions at a convention of priests in Abo in 1573 and which gives an insight into the ecclesiastical conditions of the time. He emphasized especially that the priests in their conduct should be models for the members of the congregation. For the guidance of priests he compiled a collection of sermons which, however, was never printed. The manuscript was burned in the great conflagration in Abo in 1827 when many other treasures perished. In 1574 he published a Finnish catechism in Stockholm and in the following year a manual. He also collected everything that was known of church conditions in Finland in the Middle Ages, under the title *Chronicon episcoporum Finlandensium* (ed. H. G. Porthan, Abo, 1784–1800; also, ed. C. Annerstedt, in Faut, *Scriptores rerum Svecicarum*, iii., section 2, Upsala, 1871, pp. 132–135), and has been justly called the father of the church history of Finland. Not less important and influential was his younger contemporary, Ericus Erici. He was born in the middle of the sixteenth century, studied abroad, and after his return became rector of Gefle in Sweden (1578). In 1583 he was appointed bishop of both Finnish dioceses. He wrote an extensive catechism for the clergy and the first book of homilies in the Finnish language which was still read and loved in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

4. The Seventeenth Century.

An important event in the intellectual and spiritual life of Finland was the foundation of the academy in Abo (1640). A gymnasium, founded ten years before, had shown itself insufficient for the increased demands of education; the population at that time had increased to about 400,000 persons. The number of professors in the academy was eleven, of whom three were in the theological faculty. While this concerned chiefly the higher circles of society, another event occurred a few years later, the effect of which was felt in the most distant parts of the land—in 1642 the people received the whole Bible in a Finnish translation (see Bible Versions, B, V.). School

affairs were regulated by an order, issued by Queen Christina in 1649, according to which there were to be three kinds of educational institutions—academies, gymnasia, and schools.

After the vigorous period of the Reformation theology degenerated into dead orthodoxy. One of the most zealous defenders of the Lutheran doctrine was Professor Enevald Svenonius in Abo who in his zeal for pure doctrine caused the deposition of Bishop Terserus, a deserving man, for alleged syncretistic views. The extreme desire for pure doctrine manifested itself also in the notorious trials for witchcraft at that time. Numerous persons were burned at the stake or beheaded after disgraceful trials, in Sweden as well as in Finland. Even the most intelligent men of the time labored under that delusion. The Pietistic movement has an honorable place in the annals of Finnish church history. The most noteworthy representatives of Pietism were Johannes Wegelius the Elder and Johannes Wegelius the Younger. The older Wegelius corresponded with Spener; the younger Wegelius published a book of homilies *Se evangelium-illinen Volgeus* ("The Evangelical Light") which went through three editions. The latter decades of the seventeenth century may justly be called the period of the two bishops, father and son, each named Johannes Gezelius. They were conservative in theology and made it their principal task to educate the common people (see GEZELIUS, JOHANNES).

The end of the seventeenth century was a time of great distress and suffering for Finland. A hundred thousand persons died of hunger. King Charles XII. of Sweden led his people from war to war, and extreme poverty was the natural consequence. The new century also began with tumult of war and shedding of blood. The great Northern War sacrificed thousands of Finns. For a quarter of a century suffering increased from year to year in an incredible degree. The period from 1713 to 1721 is called the time of great discord in the history of Finland. It seemed as if all life ceased to pulsate. The peace of Nystod in 1721 put an end to the bloody days of war, but a long time passed before order was restored. Russia took possession of a considerable portion of eastern Finland, and the rest of the country underwent a new development. The cathedral chapter of the East was transferred from Viborg to Borgo where it is still. As the war had exhausted almost all material resources, the interests of the Church naturally suffered. The new spirit of the nineteenth century which governed all Europe even entered Finland. The free thought of France pervaded the court of King Gustavus III. in Stockholm, and thence spread among the lower classes of society. The Church of Finland presented the same picture of stupor and indifference as the rest of Protestant Christianity. A barren moralism took the place of a vivid faith; but in this time of need God sent a powerful awakening,—a new Pietism originated in Finland. Its author was Paavo Ruotsalainen, a peasant. A great number of younger clergymen joined the movement, while the older clergy showed more conservative sentiments. F G. Hedberg separated from the movement, taking a more Evangelical course, and found many adherents (see BORNHOLMERS). There are today two main tendencies in the Finnish Church—one keeping more strictly to the Law, whose adherents gathered later around the doctrinal system of J. T. Beck, the well-known theologian of Tübingen (see BECK, JOHANN TOBIAS), and a more Evangelical one whose acknowledged leader was Hedberg. Many Christian sects have also made propaganda—Baptists, Methodists, Adventists, and others. Free-churchism has its workers here and there. For some decades the sect of the Læstadians, called after Provost Lars Levi Læstadius, has been active in northern and southern Finland.

5. The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.

In 1850, Finland was divided into three dioceses—Abo, Borgo, and Kuopio; in 1897 Nyslott was added as a fourth. Since 1817 the bishop of Abo has been archbishop and thus primate of the Finnish Church. From 1839 to 1843 a theological periodical was published at Abo, the *Ecklesiastikt Litteraturblad.* Bishop Schauman edited for some years (1869–72) *Sanningsvittnet* ("Witness of truth"). Professor Raboergh, who later became bishop, edited a valuable periodical for theology and Church. At present there are two periodicals: *Theologisk tidskrift* and *Wartija* ("Watchman"). The new church law, enacted on July 1, 1870, was of great importance. According to it, representatives of the laity have the right of decision in ecclesiastical questions. A general convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Finland meets every tenth year, or oftener, if necessary. It discusses vital questions of the Church, such as changes in church law, introduction of new church books, catechisms, Bible translations, etc. Another event of the most vital importance was the separation of Church and school, in 1870. At present, there are 1,273 elementary schools. As Finland does not yet possess any civil lists, the church registers of the congregations are the only official documents upon which the census is based. Consequently is it the duty of pastors to keep registers of crimes, vaccination, and lists of men subject to military duty. Since the church convention of 1886 Finland has had a new hymn-book, catechism, and collection of pericopes. A Bible committee is preparing a new translation of the Bible which is necessitated by the national awakening of the last decades and the development of the language. After the great conflagration at Abo in 1827. the university was removed from that city to Helsingfors. The teaching force of the university has been doubled since 1640, but the theological faculty consists of only four ordinary professors. A candidate of theology must have been two years in service before the respective cathedral chapter admits him to the official examination which gives him the privilege of applying for a pastorate. There are consistorial and imperial pastorates. In the former case the preacher is elected by the congregation and confirmed by the cathedral chapter, in the latter case the confirmation comes

6. Present Conditions.

from the government. Since 1842 the Finnish Church has had a widows' or pension fund from which widows and orphans of preachers and teachers receive annual pensions. On the whole, the Finnish people are attached to the Church. The increase of merely external education among the common people has to a certain degree loosened their attachment, and some school teachers are hostile to the Church. Moreover, the antiecclesiastical press has tried to sow discord and estrange people from the Church, but so far without success. See SWEDEN. (J. A. CEDERBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature, mostly in Finnish and Swedish, is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, vi. 66. Sources are: M. P. Juusten, *Chronicon episcoporum Finlandensium*, ed. H. G. Porthan, Abo, 1784–1800; H. G. Porthan, *Opera selecta*, 5 vols., Helsingfors, 1859–73; *Registrum ecclesiæ Aboensis*, ib. 1890. Consult, M. J. Alopæus, *Borga gymnasii historia*, Borga, 1804; *Finnland und die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche*, Berlin, 1868; *Finland in the Nineteenth Century*, Helsingfors, 1894; J. R. Fisher, *Finland and the Tsars, 1809–99*, London, 1899; Dwight, Tupper and Bliss, *Encyclopedia of Missions*, pp. 236–237, New York, 1904.

FINLEY, SAMUEL: American Presbyterian, fifth president of the College of New Jersey (Princeton); b. in County Armagh, Ireland, 1715; d. in Philadelphia, Pa., July 17, 1766. Having received a good education from his parents, who were of Scottish descent, he came to Philadelphia in 1734, and studied for the ministry. He was ordained by the New Brunswick presbytery in 1742 and sent to Milford, Conn., in 1843, but for preaching to the Second Society at New Haven, in violation of the statute forbidding itinerant ministers to preach in any parish without the consent of the pastor, he was expelled from the colony as a vagrant a few months later. In 1744 he accepted a call to Nottingham, Md., where he established an academy which acquired considerable fame. He remained at Nottingham till 1761, when he succeeded Samuel Davies as president of the College of New Jersey Though he never published anything but occasional sermons he enjoyed a great reputation as a scholar, and in 1763 received the degree of D.D. from the University of Glasgow. Among his sermons may be mentioned, *Christ Triumphing and Satan Raging* (1741), *The Curse of Meroz* (1757), and *On the Death of President Davies* (1761).

FINNEY, CHARLES GRANDISON: Congregationalist, revivalist, theologian and president of Oberlin College; b. at Warren, Litchfield County, Conn., Aug. 29, 1792; d. at Oberlin, O., Aug. 16, 1875. When he was two years old his parents removed to Oneida County, N. Y., thus placing him beyond the reach of more than a common school education. When about twenty he went to New Jersey, where he attended a high school and taught. In later years he acquired some knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In 1818 he entered a law office in Adams, N. Y. At that time, he says, he was "almost as ignorant of religion as a heathen" (*Autobiography*, p. 7). His curiosity was excited by quotations from the Bible in his law books, and he purchased the first copy he had ever owned, and began to attend prayer-meeting and church.

Conversion and Active Life.

His conversion in 1821 was remarkable for its suddenness, thoroughness, and the definitely marked stages of his experience. After great mental agony, in which he prayed long and fervently, suddenly, he says, "the Holy Spirit descended upon me in a manner that seemed to go through me, body and soul. I could feel the impression like a wave of electricity going through and through me" (*Autobiography*, p. 20). Feeling an immediate call to preach, he forsook the law, was received under care of presbytery (1822), and licensed to preach (1824). He at once turned his attention to revival labors, which were continued, with few interruptions until 1860, when he was forced to give up the work of an itinerant evangelist on account of age. These labors, beginning in western and central New York, were extended to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other cities of the East, and reached to England in 1849 and 1858. In 1832 he accepted a call to the pastorate of the Second Free Church of New York City, and in 1834 another to the recently organized Congregational Church in the same city, known as the Broadway Tabernacle. In 1835 he went to Oberlin as professor of theology, and he continued to labor till the time of his death as instructor, pastor, and college president (1852). During his residence at Oberlin he continued, as before, to hold revival meetings.

As Revivalist, Preacher, and Teacher.

As preacher Finney had rare gifts. Wherever he went extensive revivals prevailed. His manner was dramatic, direct, and personal. He used simple language and illustrations. His presentation was clear and strictly logical. He directed his appeals to the conscience, rather than to the emotions, and made it tremble and quake by his searching analysis of the motives of action. He chose for themes passages which delineate the sinner's condition as one of conscious alienation from God, and sinning against him. He dwelt upon the enmity of the carnal mind, the want of holiness, and the certain destruction of the impenitent. He called upon his hearers to come to an immediate decision and submit to God. "Instead of telling sinners," he says, "to use the means of grace, and pray for a new heart, I called on them to make themselves a new heart and spirit, and pressed the duty of immediate surrender to God" (*Autobiography*, p. 189). These meetings were often accompanied by violent bodily manifestations; and Finney was in the habit of calling upon the audiences to go forward to the anxious-bench, or to rise in attestation of new resolutions. These methods, his directness and calls to repentance, his departure from the doctrine of imputation and other features of the Calvinist theology early evoked criticism and strong opposition from religious associations and such church leaders as Asahel Nettleton and Lyman Beecher (qq.v.). In 1827 a convention was held at New Lebanon attended by Dr. Hawes of Hartford, Justin Edwards of Andover, Lyman Beecher of Boston, Dr. Beman of Troy, and others, to consider the matter. In course of time the opposition decreased (*Autobiography*, pp. 210–226).

Finney's preaching reached all classes, but especially lawyers and educated men, notably in Rochester and other towns of western New York. During the first twelve years of his ministry he wrote no word of his sermons and often went into the pulpit without knowing the text from which he would preach; he ascribed his speech to the suggestion of the Holy Spirit (*Autobiography*, p. 95).

As a teacher at Oberlin, Finney's influence was also great. He was an original thinker and very positive in his convictions. His *Lectures on Systematic Theology* (2 vols., Oberlin, 1846; new ed., by J. H. Fairchild, 1878) define his theological position. He held to the plenary ability of the sinner to repent, the voluntary and total moral depravity of the unregenerate man, the necessity of a radical change of heart through the truth by the agency of the Holy Spirit, and the sufficiency of the vicarious atonement for the needs of all mankind. He regarded happiness as the chief aim, and explained regeneration (which he did not clearly distinguish from conversion) to consist of an act of the will, rather than an act of the Holy Spirit. He exerted a shaping influence over the minds of his students; and his theology, in a modified form, had a wide acceptance in his own denomination. His works, beside the *Lectures on Theology* already mentioned, were *Lectures on Revivals* (Boston, 1835; many later editions); *Lectures to Professing Christians* (Oberlin, 1836); and *Sermons on Important Subjects* (New York, 1839).

D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: *Memoirs of Charles G. Finney, being an Autobiography*, New York, 1876. His life was written also by G. F. Wright, Boston, 1891; and A. M. Hills, Cincinnati, 1902. Consult also F. G. Beardsley, *Hist. of American Revivals*, pp. 118–152, New York, 1904.

FINNIAN, SAINT, OF CLONARD: The chief of the " second order of Irish saints "; b. in Leinster; d. at Clonard (in the southwest corner of County Meath, about 30 miles from Dublin) Dec. 12, c. 550. He is said to have visited Tours, to have spent several years in study at Menevia (St. David's) in Wales, and to have become acquainted there with David, Gildas, and Cadoc. He founded many monasteries and churches in his native land, of which Clonard (founded about 520) became the most famous of all the great Irish schools of the sixth century. Scholars came there from all parts of Ireland and their number is said to have reached three thousand. Finnian acquired the title of " tutor of Erin's saints " and certain of his disciples, chosen by him and including Brendan, Ciaran of Saigir, Ciaran of Clonmacnoise, and others with himself were known as the " twelve apostles of Ireland."

Bibliography: *ASB*, March, ii. 445–447; C. de Smedt and J. de Backer, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ*, pp. 189–210, Edinburgh, 1888; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, i. 464–469; ii. 21–22; Whitley Stokes, *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore*, pp. 75–83, 222–230, 342–346, Oxford, 1890; J. Healy, *Insula sanctorum*, pp. 188–208, Dublin, 1890; *DNB*, xix. 39–41.

FINNIAN, SAINT, OF MOVILLE: Irish saint of the " second order "; d. at Moville (at the head of Strangford Lough, 10 m. e. of Belfast), Sept. 10, c. 579. He is said to have been of a noble family, living near Strangford Lough. After studying in his own land, he went to Candida Casa in Galloway (see Ninian, Saint), then to Rome. Returning to Ireland he founded the monastery at Moville about 540. It was long a famous and prosperous school, representing North British traditions with those of Rome added, as the foundation of the other Finnian represented Welsh teachings. It is said that he brought from Rome a copy of the Vulgate and from this his disciple Columba transcribed the Psalter. Finnian then claimed the transcription because made from his book, while Columba insisted that it was his because it was his work. The dispute led to a battle and was one of the causes which sent Columba to Scotland (see Columba).

Bibliography: Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. 25–28; J. Healy, *Insula sanctorum*, pp. 245–257.

FINTAN, SAINT, known also as **Munnu:** Irish saint; d. at Taghmon, County Wexford (10 m. w. of Wexford), 635. He was a disciple of Comgall of Bangor. Having finished his studies, he applied for admission at Iona, but was rejected by the abbot, Baithene, who said he was acting as directed by Columba. Fintan then lived at many places in Ireland, but finally settled at Taghmon, where he became the leader of the opposition in South Ireland to the Roman Easter and other Roman customs. At the second of the two synods held to consider the matter he proposed to submit the question to the ordeal by fire and water or to a contest in miraculous power, and, when this was refused, suggested, it is said, that every one should follow his own conscience. Many stories are told illustrating his rugged character. He was impulsive, wilful, and combative, but also generous and faithful, and was highly venerated in Ireland and Scotland. His day is Oct. 21.

Bibliography: *ASB*, Oct., ix. 325–342; C. de Smedt and J. de Backer, *Acta sanctorum Hiberniæ*, pp. 393–414, 489–504, Edinburgh, 1888; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. 404–409; *DNB*, xix. 42–43; *DCB*, ii. 520.

FIRE-WORSHIPERS. See Zoroaster, Zoroastrianism.

FIRMICUS. See Maternus, Julius Firmicus.

FIRMILIAN: Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; d. at Tarsus in Cilicia 264, while on the way to the synod in Antioch against Paul of Samosata. He became bishop of Cæsarea in 232 (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 26), and with Dionysius of Alexandria (q.v.) ranked as one of the most eminent churchmen of his time in the East. He was a friend of Origen (Eusebius, vi. 27), and an opponent of the Novatians (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VI., xlvi. 3; cf. VII., v. 1). He is especially known for his antagonism to Pope Stephen I. in the strife over baptism by heretics (see Heretic Baptism). In a long letter to Cyprian of Carthage, preserved in Latin translation among Cyprian's letters (lxxv. [lxxiv]; Eng. transl. in *ANF*, v. 390–397), he emphatically maintains that heresy lacks the Spirit, and that a heretic baptism is invalid. He also speaks of the " audacity, insolence," and " pride " of the Roman bishop, and, under cover of reference to the paschal controversies, deduces the conclusion that Rome by no means invariably appeared as the custodian

of true tradition. This letter is his only extant work. Of its genuineness, once contested in Roman Catholic quarters, there should be no doubt; and Ritschl's assumption of interpolations is to be rejected. Firmilian is celebrated in the Oriental Church on Oct. 28. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: O. Ritschl, *Cyprian von Karthago*, pp. 126–134, Göttingen, 1885; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 407 sqq.; J. Ernst, in *ZKT*, xviii (1894), 209–259 (on the genuineness of the letter); E. W. Benson, *Cyprian, his Life, Times and Work*, pp. 387–396, London, 1897; *DCB*, ii. 521–522.

FIRST-BORN. See FAMILY AND MARRIAGE RELATIONS, HEBREW, § 16.

FIRST-FRUITS—1. In the Old Testament: In common with other nations of antiquity the Hebrews consecrated the first proceeds of field or flock (Gk. *aparchai*, Lat. *primitiæ*) to the deity; this is the essence of the sacrificial cult (cf. Dillmann on Lev xxiii. 14, and Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, pp. 443 sqq., 104, 210, 220 sqq.). The general term for first-fruits in Hebrew is *re'shith* ("the first of"; applied to land, Deut. xxxiii. 21; to the harvest, Lev. xxiii. 10; to fruit, Deut. xxvi. 2, 10; Ezek. xliv. 30); whereas *bikkurim* is a special term (used of new grain and fruit, Lev. xxiii. 20; Ex. xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22; Num. xviii. 13; Neh. x. 35, xiii. 31; of figs [Neh. iii. 12]; of grapes, Num. xiii. 20; etc.); the term applied to animals (firstlings) and man (first-born) is *peṭer reḥem* (Ex. xiii. 2, 15, xxiv. 19; Num. iii. 12, xviii. 15; Ezek. xx. 26) or simply *peṭer* (Ex. xiii. 20–21, xxxiv. 20; but cf. in poetic diction, Gen. xlix. 3; Deut. xxi. 17; Ps. lxxviii. 51). As the firstling belonged to the holy taxes (see TAXATION, HEBREW), so the expression *terumah* ("lift" or "heave-[offering]") includes, if used in its general sense (Lev. xxii. 12; Num. v. 9), besides the first-born, the tithe, the "ban," and plunder, also the firstlings (Num. xv. 19, xviii. 11, xxxi. 41).

As an expression of gratitude to him who had given both land and harvest there were at the feasts in the name of the whole people (1) the waving of the first sheaf, of barley, on the Sunday of the Mazzoth-week (16th of Nisan; cf. Dillmann on Lev. xxiii. 11), when other sacrifices were also offered (Lev. xxiii. 10–14); (2) seven weeks later, the two "wave"-loaves, baked out of leavened dough (of two-tenths of an ephah of new flour), offered as a peace offering with two yearling lambs (Lev. xxiii. 15–21; cf. Dillmann on vs. 18).

Besides these national offerings every individual brought his first-fruits, though the quantity was optional. These were in their natural state, as grain, fruit, honey, wool (first-fruits of the field); or partly refined as wine (first-fruits of the vineyard), as oil (first-fruits of the olive-groves), as bread or cake (first-fruits of flour). All these were perquisites of the priest, who alone might eat them (Num. xviii. 11–13 [P]; Deut. xviii. 4 [D]; Ezek. xliv. 30) though a part was used in the sacrificial meal (Deut. xxvi. 1–2; cf. xii. 16). From Prov. iii. 9–10, Mal. iii. 8, Job i. 6, Ecclus. xxv. 10, I Macc. iii. 49 it may be inferred that the "first-fruits" enjoyed popular approval, which "tithe" and "first-born" lacked (cf. II Kings iv. 42).

In a class by themselves, somewhat analogous to the cattle, were young fruit-trees of which not the first-fruits as such, but those of the fourth year were brought, the first three years' produce being regarded as unclean and neither gathered nor eaten (Lev. xix. 23–25). First-fruits of the field, and of the vineyards and olive-groves were to be brought yearly; the former, it was decreed, should be brought voluntarily and early (Ex. xxii. 29; xxiii. 19 [Book of the Covenant]; xxxiv. 26 [J] and according to Deut. xxvi. 1–2 [D]) in a basket; the rest of the firstlings was used for a meal (cf. Dillmann on Deut. xxvi. 11 and Nowack, *Archäologie*, Freiburg, 1894, ii. 256). As the first-fruits furnished the income of the priests they were later gathered in the store-rooms of the temple, to be used as required (II Chron. xxxi. 5, 11; Neh. x. 37, 39, xii. 44, xiii. 5; Mal. iii. 8, 10). The range was later extended to sheep's and goat's wool (Deut. xviii. 4) and honey (II Chron. xxxi. 5).

As the Old Testament law gives no instruction as to quantity or quality, or the place and manner of delivery, this was added in the Mishnah-tracts *Bikkurim* and *Terumoth* and may have been really observed later; wine and oil were to be no less than one-sixtieth of the harvest (one-thirtieth or one-fortieth was considered highly liberal, *Terum.* iv. 3); the *bikkurim* proper were limited to the seven products of Deut. viii. 8 (with dates in place of honey). These regulations apply only to Palestine; Jews remote from Jerusalem may bring their offerings dried. The ceremony of delivery is described (for a vivid picture of a Bikkurim-procession cf. Delitzsch, *Jüdisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu*, Erlangen, 1875, 66; Eng. transl., London, 1877, 94), and the time was set not before Pentecost nor after the Feast of Dedication (*Bikkurim*, i. 3). The *terumoth* proper were to be delivered "to the priests" in their cities (*Bikkurim*, ii. 4) and included products from Jewish farms abroad (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* XVI., vi. 7; Philo, ii. 568); direction is given how and by whom they are to be eaten, and how the layman, who consciously or unconsciously eats of the *terumoth* is to be punished. (VICTOR RYSSEL†.)

2. Ecclesiastical. See TAXATION, ECCLESIASTICAL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The commentaries on the passages cited in the text; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 244–254, Eng. transl. II. i. 237–242; *DB*, ii. 10–11; *EB*, ii. 1525–26; *JE*, v. 398–400.

FISCH, GEORGES: Swiss Protestant; b. at Nyon (14 m. n. of Geneva), Switzerland, July 6, 1814; d. at Vallorbe (30 m. n.w. of Lausanne) July 3, 1881. After finishing his theological studies at Lausanne he was pastor of a small German church at Vévay for five years. In 1846 he went to Lyons, France, as assistant to Adolphe Monod (q.v.) of the Free Church, whom he succeeded. In 1855 he was called to Paris to succeed Louis Bridel. He was warmly attached to the cause of the Free Churches, took part in the constitutional synod of 1849, and was president of the Synodal Commission from 1863 till his death. He was the chief support of the Evangelical Alliance in France and attended the conferences at London, Paris, Berlin, Geneva, Amsterdam and New York.

He was an active member of various home and foreign missionary societies. His principal publications are, *Union des églises évangéliques de France* (Paris, 1862); and *Les États-Unis en 1861* (1862).

FISCHER, ANTON HUBERT: Cardinal; b. at Jülich (15 m. n.e. of Aachen), Germany, May 30, 1840. He studied in Bonn and Münster, and was ordained to the priesthood at Cologne in 1863. After being instructor in religion at the gymnasium of Essen 1864–88, he was consecrated titular bishop of Juliopolis and suffragan bishop of Cologne. In 1903 he became archbishop of Cologne, and in the same year was created cardinal priest of Santi Nereo ed Achilleo, Rome. He has also been canon of Cologne Cathedral since 1888 and dean of the chapter since 1894, while in 1904 he was nominated to the Prussian House of Lords. Among his writings mention may be made of his *De salute infidelium*, (Essen, 1886).

FISH.—1. In the Old Testament: In the Old Testament fish are not named by species. The large aquatic animals, including the crocodile, are designated as *tannin* (see DRAGON). The food-law (Lev. xi. 9–12), aiming ostensibly at a classification of fish, divides all things that move in the water into those that have scales and fins and those that have not, the former being clean, the latter unclean. Almost all fish belong to the first class. In Palestine fish abound in the Jordan, the Sea of Galilee, and in perennial brooks. The Sea of Galilee has a few varieties not found elsewhere, except in tropical waters like the Nile.

There is seldom mention of fish as food in early Biblical times. After the Exile, and with the advance of the art of cooking, fish became a more important article of diet. The Tyrians marketed their fish, dried and salted, in Jerusalem (Neh. xiii. 16), where a city-gate near the fish-market was called the " fish-gate " (Neh. iii. 3, and elsewhere). Salt fish (Gk. *tariché*) was imported from Egypt. The name of the town Tarichеæ on the Sea of Galilee and the frequent mention of brine in the Mishnah show that the custom of pickling fish obtained in Palestine. In the time of Jesus fish was a common article of food (Matt. vii. 10, xiv. 17, xv. 34; Luke xxiv. 42).

No account of the catching of fish has come down from the older Biblical period; but figures of speech employed by the prophets show that fishing was generally known (Amos iv. 2; Jer. xvi. 16; Ezek. xxix. 4; and elsewhere). In the New Testament professional fishers lived near the Sea of Galilee (Luke v. 1–2, and elsewhere). As regards fishing tackle, various nets are mentioned in the New Testament; the large drag-net (*sagēnē*, Matt. xiii. 47), as well as the casting-net (*diktyon* = the small, *amphiblēstron* = the large casting-net, Matt. iv. 18–20) were certainly in use in the older period (Is. xix. 8; Hab. i. 15). Fishing-hooks (Job xli. 1; Amos iv. 2; Matt. xvii. 27) and spears or harpoons are also mentioned (Job xli. 7). Fishing was carried on chiefly by night. I. BENZINGER.

2. As a Symbol and in Christian Art. See SYMBOLISM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best treatment is in H. B. Tristram, *Survey of Western Palestine, the Fauna and Flora*, London, 1884. A comprehensive discussion may be found in *EB*, ii 1526–31, cf. i. 519–523 (on " Behemoth and Leviathan "). Consult also: *DB*, ii. 11–12; J. G. Wood, *Bible Animals*, New York, 1883; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 39, 91, 94, 205.

FISH, HENRY CLAY: American Baptist; b. at Halifax, Vt., Jan. 27, 1820; d. at Newark, N. J., Oct. 2, 1877. He received an academic education and, after teaching two years in Massachusetts, entered Union Theological Seminary, New York, where he was graduated in 1845. He was pastor of the Baptist church at Somerville, N. J., from 1845 till 1851, and of the First Baptist Church of Newark from 1851 till his death. During the Civil War he supported the Union, and on being drafted in June, 1864, he insisted on going to the front, but finally agreed to send a substitute. He was an ardent and efficient worker in extending the Baptist Church, and also did much to popularize life insurance, publishing several works on the subject. His numerous religious writings and compilations include, *Primitive Piety Revived* (Boston, 1855); *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence* (2 vols., New York, 1856); *Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century* (1857); *Handbook of Revivals* (Boston, 1874); and *Bible Lands Illustrated* (Hartford, 1876), the result of eight months spent abroad in 1874.

FISHER, GEORGE PARK: Congregationalist; b. at Wrentham, Mass., Aug. 10, 1827. He studied at Brown University (B.A., 1847), Yale Divinity School, Andover Theological Seminary (from which he was graduated in 1851), and in Germany. He was professor of divinity and college preacher in Yale College 1854–61 and professor of ecclesiastical history in the Yale Divinity School 1861–1901. He has written: *The Supernatural Origin of Christianity* (New York, 1865); *Life of Benjamin Silliman* (1866); *History of the Reformation* (1873; new ed., 1906); *The Beginnings of Christianity* (1877); *Faith and Rationalism* (1879); *Discussions in History and Theology* (1880); *The Christian Religion* (1882); *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* (1883); *Outlines of Universal History* (1885); *History of the Christian Church* (1888); *Manual of Christian Evidences* (1890); *Nature and Method of Revelation* (1890); *Colonial History of the United States* (1892); *Manual of Natural Theology* (1893); *History of Christian Doctrine* (1896); *Brief History of the Nations* (1896); and *Edwards on the Trinity* (1903).

FISHER, JOHN: Bishop of Rochester; b. at Beverley (9 m. n.n.w. of Hull), Yorkshire, 1459; d. in London June 22, 1535. He was educated in his native town and at Michaelhouse, Cambridge (B.A., 1487; M.A., 1491), of which he became master in 1497. In this same year he was appointed confessor of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and mother of the king. Four years later he was elected vice-chancellor of his university, and in 1503 he was appointed by Margaret to her newly established professorship of divinity, and in 1504 was chosen chancellor of Cambridge, being reelected annually until 1514, when he was ap-

pointed for life. In 1504 he was consecrated to the see of Rochester, but his interest in his university was undiminished, and he was active in the foundation both of Christ's College and of St. John's College, in addition to holding the presidency of Queen's College from 1505 to 1508. Though he induced Erasmus to visit Cambridge, Fisher was a faithful adherent of Roman Catholicism, and assailed the teachings of Luther in his *Confutatio assertionis Lutheranæ* (Antwerp, 1523) and other treatises, criticizing as well Œcolampadius and Velenus—the latter maintained that the Apostle Peter never was in Rome.

Fisher lost the royal favor by his opposition to Henry's claim to spiritual supremacy and to the divorce of Queen Catherine, whose confessor he was. His unpopularity was increased by his unfortunate belief in the impostures of Elizabeth Barton (q.v.), the Maid of Kent, who named him one of her confederates. Early in 1534 he was sentenced to be attainted of misprision, to be imprisoned at the king's pleasure, and to forfeit all his goods, although he was released on the payment of £300. On Apr. 13, however, he was cited to appear at Lambeth to take the oath of compliance with the Act of Succession, but though he and Sir Thomas More were willing to admit the succession of the children of Henry and Anne Boleyn, both refused to declare the children of Catherine and the king illegitimate. Three days later Fisher was committed to the Tower, and with the passage of the Act of Supremacy in Nov., 1534, both Fisher and More were again attainted of misprision of treason and the see of Rochester was declared vacant from Jan. 2, 1535. Fisher's doom was sealed by the inadvertent act of Paul III., who on May 20 created him cardinal priest of St. Vitalis, not knowing the extreme danger in which the bishop stood. Henry, in fury, forbade the hat to be brought to England, and Fisher was trapped into statements which were twisted into treason. On June 17 he was condemned to be executed at Tyburn as a traitor, but the sentence was changed to decapitation at Tower Hill, where it was carried out a fortnight before the execution of More. The chief works of Fisher were his *De unica Magdalena* (Par s, 1519) and his *De eucharistia contra Johannem Œcolampadium* (Cologne, 1527); the greater part of his Latin writings were collected and published at Würzburg in 1597 A volume of a projected edition of his English works was edited for the Early English Text Society by J. E. B. Mayor (London, 1876), and a few other writings by him are extant in manuscript.

Bibliography: The *Life* was first written ostensibly by Thomas Bailey, really by Richard Hall, London, 1655, republished, 1835. Consult also: John Lewis, *Life of Dr. John Fisher*, 2 vols., ib. 1854; J. Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics*, ii. 262–270, ib., 1885; *DNB*, xix. 58–63.

FISK, PLINY: American Congregationalist, missionary in Syria; b. at Shelburne, Mass., June 24, 1792; d. at Beirut, Syria, Oct. 23, 1825. He was graduated from Middlebury College in 1814 and Andover Theological Seminary in 1818, and with Levi Parsons (q.v.) was appointed by the American Board to the Palestine mission in Sept., 1818. After traveling in the South for a year, raising funds for the cause of missions, he sailed from Boston for Smyrna on Nov. 3, 1819, accompanied by Parsons. During the next five years he traveled extensively in Greece, Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, learning languages, particularly Greek and Arabic, and distributing tracts and Bibles. In May, 1825, he joined the mission at Beirut. He preached in Italian, French, Greek, and Arabic, published a number of papers in the *Missionary Herald*, and on the day before his death completed an English-Arabic dictionary.

Bibliography: A. Bond, *Memoir of P. Fisk*, Boston, 1828; R. Anderson, *History of the Missions of the American Board, Oriental Missions*, vol. ii., ib. 1872.

FISK, WILBUR: First president of Wesleyan University (Conn.); b. in Brattleboro, Vt., Aug. 31, 1792; d. at Middletown, Conn., Feb. 2, 1839. After his graduation from Brown University (1815) he studied law, but became an itinerant minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1818. He held pastorates at Craftsbury, Vt., and Charlestown, Mass., and was presiding elder of the Vermont district 1823–27, when he was placed upon the superannuated list. For a time he was agent of the Newmarket (N. H.) Academy, where he was chosen to make the address of welcome to Lafayette in 1824. He was chaplain of the Vermont legislature in 1826, principal of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, Mass., 1826–31, and president of Wesleyan University 1831–39. He had aided materially in the organization of the university, and under his direction it became the most influential educational institution of the Methodist denomination in America. While traveling in Europe in 1836 he was elected bishop, but declined the office. In 1828 he had declined the bishopric of the Canada conference. Besides occasional sermons and lectures, he published *The Science of Education* (Middletown, 1831; New York, 1832), the inaugural address on the opening of Wesleyan University; *The Calvinistic Controversy* (New York, 1837); and *Travels in Europe* (1838).

Bibliography: J. Holdich, *Life of W. Fisk*, New York, 1842; D. D. Whedon, *A Tribute to the Memory of President Fisk*, ib. 1839.

FISTULA: A tube, usually of gold or silver, through which the consecrated wine of the Eucharist was administered to the communicant. Its use came up in the sixth century, when the particularly holy character of this wine was generally recognized. The priests had never used it themselves, and so, when the cup was withdrawn from the laity, the fistula was entirely laid aside, except in the papal masses, where to-day the pope receives the Eucharistic wine through a golden fistula.

FITZGERALD, JAMES NEWBURY: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Newark, N. J., July 27, 1837; d. at Hongkong, China, Apr. 3, 1907. He was admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1858, but in 1862 gave up his practise and entered the Methodist ministry. After holding various pastorates in the Newark Conference he was recording secretary of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from 1880 till in 1888 he was elected bishop. Besides being presiding elder of the Newton, New-

ark, and Jersey City districts and secretary of the Newark Conference for eleven years, he was a member of the General Conference in 1876, 1880, 1884, and 1888.

FIVE MILE ACT: An Act of Parliament passed in 1665, and completing the system of measures intended to repress the non-conformists known as the Clarendon Code. By its provisions no clergyman who had been expelled from his living by the Act of Uniformity of 1662 was to come within five miles of a city or corporate town, or of any parish where he had formally preached, unless he declared that he would not " at any time attempt any alteration of government either in Church or State," under a penalty of forty pounds; and no one who had not taken the oath of passive obedience and conformed was to teach in any school or take pupils in his house. As the Puritan congregations were mainly in the towns, this act cut them off from the ministrations of their chosen leaders and in most cases from even private education, and hastened the decline of Puritanism throughout England.

Bibliography: The text is printed in Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, pp. 620–623. Consult: D. Neal, *History of the Puritans*, ii. 255 sqq. of Harper's ed., New York, n.d.; J. H. Overton, *Church in England*, ii. 143, London, 1897.

FIVE POINTS OF CALVINISM: The five characteristic tenets of Calvinism as opposed to Arminianism, defended by the Synod of Dort (1618–19) in answer to the Five Articles of the Arminians or Remonstrants, put forth in 1610. They are particular predestination, limited atonement, natural inability, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of saints. See Arminius, Jacobus, and Arminianism; Calvinism; Remonstrants.

FLACIUS, MATTHIAS.

Early Life (§ 1).
In Wittenberg. Opposition to Melanchthon (§ 2).
In Magdeburg. The Adiaphoristic Controversy (§ 3).
The Majoristic, Osiandrian, and Schwenckfeldian Controversies (§ 4).
Fruitless Attempts at Reconciliation (§ 5).
Flacius Professor in Jena (§ 6).
The Synergistic Dispute (§ 7).
Flacius a Wanderer (§ 8).
Last Days at Frankfort (§ 9).
Flacius' Literary and Scholarly Work (§ 10).

Flacius (Latinized from Vlacich, or Francovich) was born at Albona (42 m. s.s.e. of Trieste), Istria, Mar. 3, 1520, and died at Frankfort-on-the-Main Mar. 11, 1575. From his birthplace he was surnamed *Illyricus*. His father, a prominent citizen of Albona, died when Flacius was a mere boy. He received his early education from the celebrated humanist Baptista Egnatius in Venice. Being a good Catholic he decided to become a monk, study theology, and preach, but his uncle, Baldo Lupetino, provincial of the Minorites, commended Luther to him as a restorer of the true Gospel and sent him to Germany in 1539. He now continued his studies at Basel, but went to Tübingen in 1540, and to Wittenberg in 1541, where he was favorably received and assisted by Melanchthon. After an inner conflict that lasted three years, Bugenhagen directed him to Luther and it was through him that Flacius attained peace of soul by accepting the free grace of God. He had personal experience of the consolation of the Evangelical doctrine of justification by faith alone, and henceforth the defense of this doctrine in its purity and inviolability became the guiding star of his life.

1. Early Life.

In 1544 he accepted the chair of Hebrew at the university, in 1545 he married, and in 1546 received the master's degree. His extraordinary gifts excited great expectations with Luther and Melanchthon. He lectured on the Old Testament, epistles of Paul and on Aristotle; but his activity was suddenly interrupted by the outbreak of the Schmalkald War. In 1547 he fled to Brunswick, where he lived by teaching. After a few months, however, he was able to return to Wittenberg, but the time of rest was now over for him. After the Augsburg Interim in 1548 the Elector Maurice of Saxony entered into negotiations with the theologians and estates of his realm which resulted in the Leipsic Interim (see Interim). It was then that Flacius as a strict Lutheran protested against the concessions of Melanchthon and the men who shared his views. From now on his relations with the head of the conciliatory party became more and more strained and his position at Wittenberg untenable. After a short sojourn at Hamburg he settled in 1549 at Magdeburg, where printing and publication were still free.

2. In Wittenberg. Opposition to Melanchthon.

In Magdeburg he developed a comprehensive literary activity against the Melanchthonians, and now those unfortunate and often petty quarrels arose which injured the Evangelical cause more than the opposition of the Roman Catholics. The fault was not altogether on one side. In Wittenberg Flacius' departure was ascribed to the most unworthy motives. Flacius contributed not a little by his arrogant and obstinate character and by assuming the rôle of dictator. He published treatises against the Interim, and the Adiaphora (q.v.) and their defenders. His criticism was sweeping, and it was due to him more than to any one else that public protest made the execution of the Interim impossible, and thus Luther's great work was saved. From that point of view he rendered inestimable services to the Evangelical Church; especially in his fight against the Adiaphora he proved himself to be on the right side and Melanchthon had to acknowledge his victory. When Magdeburg fell into the hands of the elector Maurice (1551) attempts were made to reconcile the two opposing parties, the Magdeburg and the Wittenberg circles. In the absence of Flacius, Gallus and his associates agreed to negotiate under the condition that no compromise with the pope should be made. Certain articles were drawn up, but Flacius, full of suspicion, declared them unsatisfactory and so the pacificatory work was disrupted.

3. In Magdeburg. The Adiaphoristic Controversy.

The adiaphoristic dispute was followed by that concerning Georg Major (q.v.), who in a sermon preached at Eisleben had maintained the necessity

of works for salvation. This controversy was carried on with the same relentless, cruel, and bitter personal insinuations. In 1552 the Osiandrian dispute arose (see OSIANDER, ANDREAS). Osiander taught that justification is attained by the indwelling of the essential justice of Christ through faith. In this case Flacius put himself on the side of the Melanchthonians, showing thereby that the fight against his former teachers was not personal. Again as a strict Lutheran, he developed clearly the doctrine of forensic satisfaction. In 1553 he attacked the mystic subjectivism of Caspar Schwenckfeld, who made a distinction between an inner word of God and the letter in Holy Scripture, and here also Flacius prepared the way for Lutheran orthodoxy as laid down in the Formula of Concord by maintaining the identity of the external word and the word of God.

4. The Majoristic, Osiandrian, and Schwenckfeldian Controversies.

In the mean time further attempts were made to assuage the dissensions of the Magdeburg and Wittenberg circles for the sake of concord in the Evangelical party. As early as 1553 Flacius and Gallus desired to have a committee of arbitration appointed, but Melanchthon was silent in the matter; then Duke Christopher of Wittenberg proposed a convention of theologians, but the Thuringian theologians Amsdorf and his associates were not in favor of it and requested the Wittenberg circle to condemn their heresies publicly. Jena in those days was the stronghold of Lutheran orthodoxy against the unionistic tendencies of Wittenberg. Several other attempts to unite the dissenting parties also failed. Now Flacius published his treatise *Von der Einigkeit* in which he addressed himself to the whole Church, attempting to justify his character against suspicions and indicating the necessary steps to be taken for the insurance of peace. Shortly afterward he wrote a letter to Melanchthon in spite of the fact that the latter had written some verses accompanying a picture which represented Flacius as an ass crowned by other asses. With relentless severity Flacius exposed in this letter his opponent's shortcomings concerning Adiaphorism and admonished him to relieve his conscience by confession of defeat. This Melanchthon professed to be willing to do, yet he rejected the articles of peace proposed by Flacius. The latter was not satisfied with this informal confession; again and again he requested written statements, official declarations, common signatures of articles and public revocations. In this way the breach became irreparable. The friends of Flacius spoiled matters by treating Melanchthon as an impenitent sinner and the younger Philippists not less by their insolent treatises against Flacius. In 1557 Flacius was called to Jena as professor of the New Testament and superintendent. Shortly after his arrival a colloquy took place in Worms (see WORMS) at which it was proposed to array Melanchthon and his associates together with the Thuringians and other theologians of the stricter school against the Romanists, but nothing was achieved at this conference because the Evangelicals themselves did not agree. This was owing, of course, chiefly to Flacius. His conduct was generally criticized, and he incurred the displeasure of many who had hitherto aided him. The so-called Frankfort Recess (q.v.), convoked in 1558 by the leading Evangelical princes, was no more successful than the other attempts at unity. Then Flacius proposed a synod and fifty prominent theologians signed the *Supplicatio pro libera, christiana et legitima synodo*, but all was in vain. A similar outcome resulted from the Naumburg Convention (q.v.) of 1561.

5. Fruitless Attempts at Reconciliation.

6. Flacius Professor in Jena.

In the mean time the Synergistic dispute had arisen in Jesus (see SYNERGISM). Victorinus Strigel (q.v.) and Superintendent Hügel of Jena criticized Flacius' doctrine concerning free will, and Duke John Frederic immediately imprisoned them. In 1560 a disputation between Flacius and Strigel took place at Weimar, the result of which was that the duke confirmed the orthodoxy of Flacius' doctrine. John Frederic, however, becoming tired of these perpetual controversies, instituted a consistory which possessed the right of excommunication and of censorship in regard to theological treatises. Flacius protested against this procedure as an act of violence, and thereupon he was deposed together with others in 1561.

7. The Synergistic Dispute.

He left Jena in 1562 with the bold idea of founding a Lutheran academy of learned men at Regensburg. Gallus received him kindly. From here he continued with untiring zeal his fight against Strigel and the Calvinistic tendencies, against the arrogance of secular authorities in encroaching upon the rights of the Church, and many other antagonists. With these polemical treatises hatred against him grew and his travels began to become dangerous. The Elector Augustus of Saxony especially persecuted him, and the Council of Regensburg found it impossible to protect him longer. In Antwerp William of Orange had allowed at this time to the Lutherans as well as the Calvinists the public exercise of their religion. The Lutheran congregation, needing the counsel of experienced German theologians, called Flacius. He arrived in 1566, but the following year he had to leave the country before the progress of the Spanish army. He attempted now to settle at Frankfort-on-the-Main and then at Strasburg, but the cruel hatred of the Elector Augustus reached him even here; in 1569 the elector sent an envoy to Strasburg with the commission to capture Flacius. He fled to Basel, but was not allowed to remain, so he returned to Strasburg and in spite of the pressure exerted by the elector was tolerated. But now he spoiled his good relations with the Strasburg clergy by his opposition against the efforts at union made by Jacob Andreä (q.v.) and by his doctrine concerning original sin; for he was accused of the Manichean heresy. In 1573 the Council of Strasburg decreed his expulsion.

8. Flacius a Wanderer.

In a treatise *De peccati originalis aut veteris*

Adami appellationibus et essentia Flacius maintained that original sin is the substance of man himself and not an accident as Strigel taught. This doctrine was chiefly aimed at the Synergists. Flacius was altogether orthodox on this point. The whole controversy amounted to nothing since he attached to the word *substantia* two different meanings, it was a mere quibble of words, and yet there were men like Hesshusen (q.v.) who absurdly believed that Flacius considered the devil as the creator of substance.

9. Last Days at Frankfort.

After his expulsion from Strasburg he settled at Frankfort, where he was ably protected by Catharina von Meerfeld, prioress of the nunnery *Zu den weissen Frauen*, although the Council of the city had not given him permission to remain. Thanks to entreaties and intercessions his order of banishment was deferred from time to time until his death.

10. Flacius' Literary and Scholarly Work.

In spite of all quarrels and turbulences of his life Flacius possessed such a tenacity and determination that he found time for scientific works which required the most extensive preparation and gradual ripening. He was not only the most learned Lutheran theologian, but also the promoter and founder of theological disciplines. He was chiefly prominent in the sphere of church history. In Magdeburg he conceived the great plan of two historical works in which he could deal heavy blows at Romanism. He undertook a catalogue of all those who before Luther had combated the heresies of the papacy, and in this way originated his *Catalogus testium veritatis, qui ante nostram ætatem reclamarunt Papæ* (Basel, 1556) and its complement *Varia doctorum piorumque virorum de corrupto ecclesiæ statu poemata* [(1557) in which for the first time was printed Bernard of Cluny's *De contemptu mundi*]. Still more important was his other plan to write a church history from the original sources which should show how the Church of Christ had deviated from her right course since the time of the apostles, and include a history of antichristianity from its beginning to the development of its highest power and to the restitution of true religion in its purity by Luther. The outcome of this plan was the so-called "Magdeburg Centuries" (Basel, 1562–74; see MAGDEBURG CENTURIES). Flacius found many patrons who aided his great undertaking financially and he also made extensive travels in Germany, searching for sources and documents. Many assistants helped him. Many manuscripts and books were bought or donated by patrons. The Magdeburg Centuries denotes a great progress in the science of Church history, not only on account of its extensive tracing of the sources, but also on account of its method. The anti-Roman interest had sharpened the vision and made it capable of critical achievements that marked a new epoch. [In reply Baronius produced his superior "Annals."] Finally Flacius produced two works of importance in the sphere of Biblical science: his *Clavis scripturæ sacræ seu de sermone sacrarum literarum* (1567) and *Glossacompendiaria in Novum Testamentum* (1570).

Flacius compels admiration by his learning and extraordinary scholarly achievements, his indefatigable capacity for work, his indomitable zeal in defense of pure doctrine, but it is impossible to overlook certain grave defects in his nature, such as arrogance, obstinacy, and even malice—in fact an entire inability to appreciate the rights of others and their motives. [It is more charitable to suppose that he was mentally slightly unbalanced.] (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Some of his letters are in *CR*, viii. and ix. and the *Supplementum*. His merits were long insufficiently appreciated and his rehabilitation is largely due to A. Twesten, *Matthias Flaccius Illyricus, eine Vorlesung*, Berlin, 1844, and W. Preger, *Matthias Flaccius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1859–61 (a list of his many publications is given ii. 539–572). Consult also J. J. I. Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, ii. 224 sqq., Regensburg, 1848; A. Ritschl, *Theologie und Metaphysik*, pp. 52 sqq., Bonn, 1881; *ADB*, vii. 88 sqq.

FLAGELLATION, FLAGELLANTS.

I. Flagellation.
Corporal Punishment as a Penalty of the Church (§ 1).
Self-scourging or Flagellation (§ 2).
II. Flagellants.
The Flagellants of 1260. Venturinus of Bergamo, 1334 (§ 1).
The Flagellants of 1348–49 (§ 2).
The Albati or Bianchi of 1399 (§ 3).
Flagellants in Thuringia about 1360. Konrad Schmid (§ 4).
Later Italian Brotherhoods (§ 5).
Later Manifestations and Developments (§ 6).

I. Flagellation: Corporal chastisement as an ecclesiastical corrective penalty for clerics appears in the Western Church as early as the fifth century

1. Corporal Punishment as a Penalty of the Church.

transferred from the Roman penal law, but resorted to only in rare instances. From the Merovingian times onward, it became more widely diffused, and so late as the seventeenth century was appointed as a punishment in cases of blasphemy, simony, concubinage, and other offenses committed by the clergy. In corrective establishments of the Church, corporal chastisement has continued in practise against clerical delinquents confined in the same, down to the present time. Flagellation as a monastic punishment for misdeeds of monks dates back to the earliest period of monasticism, and the rule of Benedict of Nursia makes extensive use of corporal chastisement. The congregations which had their origin in the Benedictine Order, as well as the other monastic orders, sisterhoods, and knightly orders founded in the twelfth century and later, adopted flagellation; but various orders which arose after the Council of Trent did not include this penalty in their rules. For certain offenses of laymen, too (desecration of Sunday, fortune-telling, etc.), the Church from the sixth century prescribed corporal chastisement as the penalty, and flogging in particular was threatened against such offenses until the eighteenth century. Lastly, the Inquisition applied flogging and flagellation as one of the lightest penalties in case of the voluntary recantation of heresy. In penitential discipline, corporal chastisement and particularly flagellation came to

have a rapidly increasing importance after the beginning of the tenth century. Corporal chastisements in this connection are first mentioned (evidently as something newly in vogue) in the collection of canons of Regino of Prüm (c. 960); they appear as a substitute for public penance, and at first were doubtless always executed by some outside hand, mostly by the priest. The sermons of the well-known crusade-preacher Fulco of Neuilly (q.v.) so intensified ascetic zeal in Paris about 1195 that great throngs of the penitent submitted their bared bodies to Fulco's chastising.

2. Self-Scourging or Flagellation.

The beginnings of ascetic self-scourging, or flagellation proper, are still obscure. It is supposed to have originated about 1000 among certain Italian hermits, whose glowing penitential fervor became heightened into visionary and ecstatic enthusiasm, and started a religious movement which spread throughout all Italy. The hermit Marinus, who lived on an island of the Po, and his pupil Romuald (d. 1027), as well as the latter's disciples on Monte Sitrio, mutually chastised one another with rods and lashes. Flagellation at their own hands was a customary practise, in the first half of the eleventh century, among the monks of Fontavellana (near Faenza) in Umbria, a foundation of the miracle-working hermit and penitential preacher Dominic of Foligno (d. 1031); likewise among the hermits of Luceoli in Umbria, who styled themselves disciples of St. Romuald. In both places the monk Dominicus Loricatus (d. 1060) distinguished himself by his severe self-castigations, and they found an enthusiastic admirer and imitator in Peter Damian (q.v.), who entered the cloister of Fontavellana about 1035. To the far-reaching influence of Peter Damian, who also became prominent as the literary apologist of flagellation, its rapid extension then and afterward is preeminently due.

The monastic reform movement which emanated from Cluny with the more acute sense of sin awakened by Bernard of Clairvaux, and especially the ascetic enthusiasm propagated among the people by the mendicant orders and their preaching of Christ's Passion speedily made flagellation a most widely extended and impressive means of penance and expiation. Many of the monastic orders and sisterhoods adopted the provision of systematic self-castigation, or flagellation, in their rules. No doubt, mainly through the influence of the two great mendicant orders, this ascetic practise was then further popularized in the ranks of the laity. With most of the stricter orders (among others the Trappists, Carthusians, Priests of the Oratory, Fathers of Christian Doctrine, Discalced Carmelites, Capuchins, Redemptorists, Brothers of Charity), flagellation has continued in practise down to this day. It is exercised for the most part as a devotional act, usually once or several times in the week, according to a definitely prescribed ritual. The opposition to the practise incited by the monastic reformer Jan Busch (q.v.) is an incident without parallel.

II. Flagellants: The great flagellant pilgrimage of the year 1260 was the first of its kind. A significant prelude thereto was the powerful religious movement called forth in Italy in 1223 by the preaching of repentance and pardon by a number of mendicant monks, particularly the Dominican Giovanni da Vicenza. Deeper causes of both movements were the religious excitement and penitential disposition of the populace consequent upon the phenomenal activity of St. Francis; the extreme tension of feeling because of the passionate conflicts between papacy and empire; and the general disorder and ruin induced by these factional contests. The situation, again, was aggravated in 1259 by the outbreak of a violent epidemic; and above all by the expectation that was widely propagated by the adherents to the teaching of Joachim of Fiore (q.v.), that in the year 1260 there would occur a general revolution of things, especially a purification and renovation of the Church. The direct occasion for the flagellant crusades of that year was furnished by the advent of the venerable hermit Raniero Fasani, who as early as 1258 is alleged to have founded the first flagellant fraternity in Perugia, proclaiming that an impending visitation of judgment had been revealed to him. In the autumn of 1260 the movement overflowed all of Central and Upper Italy, still in the same year crossed the Alps and spread itself over Upper Germany and the neighboring Slavic domains. In Germany, however, both spiritual and temporal powers, as they perceived in the movement elements hostile to ecclesiastical and civil order, very decidedly opposed it as early as 1261; and with the exception of Southern France, public flagellations and flagellant crusades north of the Alps in the period between 1261 and 1349 manifested themselves only in quite isolated instances. In Upper Italy, however, the penitential sermons of the Dominican Venturinus of Bergamo gave occasion, in 1334, to an extensive new flagellant movement which came to a standstill in the very next year.

1. The Flagellants of 1260. Venturinus of Bergamo, 1334.

The great flagellant movement of the years 1348–1349 is very closely connected with the apparition of the terrible pestilence known as the black death. Originating in the East, by 1347 the plague had found entrance into Dalmatia, Upper Italy, and Southern France, and from these three centers of contagion it spread toward Central Europe in 1348. Probably attempts to avert the threatening disaster by organizing flagellant processions were first made in Italy. From Upper Italy the movement then took its course, as precursor of the plague, by way of Hungary into Germany, then into Holland, Bohemia, Poland, Denmark, and even England, and reached its climax in the summer of 1349. The populace was already highly stirred up by apocalyptic expectations, and the plague was regarded as the premonitory sign of the great revolution of all things. Flagellation seemed the fitting preparation for the coming kingdom of God, and a substitute for the clergy, grown faithless to their charge. An apocryphal letter of Christ, originating in a much earlier age,

2. The Flagellants of 1348–49.

and purporting to have fallen to the earth at Jerusalem, which with menace of frightful vindictive judgment called men to repentance, was everywhere read aloud by the wandering flagellants, and appears to have been one of the most effective instruments in their hands for extending their doctrine of penance by flagellation. In more than one instance the flagellants took a hostile stand against the clergy. They also were active in the persecutions of the Jews in 1348–49, though these, indeed, were already incited before the flagellants' appearance. Probably here also apocalyptic anticipations of a general social convulsion were a contributing factor.

As in 1260, so again in 1348–49 the flagellants formed themselves into fraternities, which usually bound their members to a penitential season of thirty-three days and a half. At such times they generally wandered far away from their homes in extended processions. Admission to the brotherhood had to be preceded by an act of general confession, reconciliation with enemies, and formal promise of unconditional obedience to the fraternity superior. All intercourse, even all conversation, with women was forbidden in most of the fraternities. The flagellants generally wore white undergarments, with mantles and hats marked with red crosses; whence they were commonly known in Germany as *Kreuzbrüder* ("Brethren of the Cross"; *Crucifratres, Cruciferi*). Self-castigation was performed twice a day, preferably in public squares, amid the intonation of hymns and according to a definitely prescribed ceremonial. Their hymns especially attracted the attention of their contemporaries. Quite a number of those of the German flagellants are recorded in the chronicles of Hugo von Reutlingen and Fritsche Closener, as well as in the *Limburger Chronik* (cf. P. Runge and H. Pfannenschmied, *Die Lieder und Melodien der Geissler des Jahres 1349*, Leipsic, 1900). There does not appear to have been a very close connection between the hymns of the Italian flagellants and those of their German brethren; but the German flagellant hymns became the basis of the hymns of the Bohemian, Polish, and Walloon flagellants. Beside the pilgrim flagellants, there also arose penitential associations which bound their members to the act of self-castigation at the brotherhood's abode. In the Netherlands there were penitential associations, organized according to parishes, which practised flagellation on Sundays and festivals, and attended to the burial of the dead (see Alexians).

The effect of the movement of 1348–49 was powerful. In many towns for several weeks running, and almost daily, there would appear new companies of pilgrims to the number of several hundred persons. At last processions of flagellant women and children appeared. For the Church, whose influence over the multitudes for the time being was completely paralyzed by the flagellation movement, it became a simple act of self-defense to oppose the movement with the sharpest weapons. On Oct. 20, 1349, Pope Clement VI. issued a bull, condemning the Flagellants and their cause in the severest terms and demanding their suppression; self-castigation was to be tolerated only within bounds of ecclesiastical regulation. The popular ferment subsided as suddenly as it had risen. By the early fifties of the same century, flagellation in Germany was nearly everywhere suppressed, and such as remained loyal to the cause were driven back into privacy as proscribed sectaries.

3. The Albati or Bianchi of 1399.

In 1399, a new flagellation movement of wide extent broke out in the Romance countries in the appearance of the so-called "Whites" (*Albati, Bianchi*); from Provence the movement spread over France, Spain, and Italy. The impulse in this case was given by fictitious revelations of future divine judgments, and the alleged command of the Virgin Mother. The movement was much enhanced by the advent of the well-known Spanish Dominican and popular saint, Vincent Ferrar (q.v.), who prophesied the immediate approach of the end of all things. Endless throngs of flagellants followed him in the wanderings through France, Spain, and Upper Italy in the years between 1400 and 1417 These flagellant crusades filled the Council of Constance with no small anxiety; Jean Gerson, in 1417, presented to the Council a memorial in which he pronounced decidedly not only against the flagellant processions, but also against self-castigation for the laity in general.

4. Flagellants in Thuringia about 1360. Konrad Schmid.

The procedure of the Church against the German flagellant brotherhoods in the period after 1349 had its equal in the fact that out of these associations there grew up a heretical flageliant sect, the combating of which occupied the Church till the end of the Middle Ages. This sect possessed an especially strong organization in Thuringia about 1360 through the apocalyptical Konrad Schmid. He calculated the date of the final judgment as the year 1369, and his numerous adherents undertook to prepare themselves for the event by penitential flagellation. It is probable that Schmid and his followers were also strongly influenced by the doctrines of the Waldenses, which were widely disseminated in Thuringia. The Thuringian flagellants are alleged to have rejected all sacraments and the entire ceremonial and hierarchical system of the Church; there was to arise instead a chiliastic kingdom, to whose government Schmid believed himself called. In 1369 many flagellants, among them Schmid himself, were burned at the stake. But his followers thenceforth identified him with Enoch and Elijah, and expected him shortly to hold the final judgment in place of Christ. From the close of the fourteenth century the Church repeatedly interposed with sanguinary severity against the Thuringian flagellants; but they furtively held their ground until the end of the fifteenth century.

The Italian flagellant associations, after their first appearance in 1260, complied in all points with the rules of the Church, and experienced no small measure of Church favor. Flagellant associations were organized in nearly all the cities of Italy; in

many cities, as for instance, in Gubbio, Perugia, and Fabriano, no fewer than three, in Padua six, existed side by side at the same time. The direction of a number of these brotherhoods, though not of all, was vested in the mendicant orders. A good many of them devoted themselves also to the care of the poor and the sick, and maintained hospitals. The Italian flagellants occupy an important position in the history of Italian literature as creators of the popular religious lyric and the spiritual drama. Even the early flagellants of 1260 had sung religious hymns in the popular speech (*laude*). Subsequently the vernacular spiritual song was zealously cultivated in the flagellant brotherhoods, more and more crowding out the Latin *hymns*, and soon becoming the most richly developed literary form in the Italian language. At an early period certain dramatic elements found their way into the spiritual popular song, the singers, for instance, turning with appeals and questions to Christ or Mary, and receiving answers from them. From this point it was but a slight step to complete dramatization of the *laude*, and the creation of the popular religious play. The stage presentation of these dramatic *laude*, whose theme, of course, purported to be first and foremost the history of the life and Passion of Christ, is to be rated henceforth among the principal services of the Italian flagellant brotherhoods. See Religious Dramas.

5. Later Italian Brotherhoods.

From the sixteenth century onward, the Society of Jesus wrought with impassioned zeal toward the diffusion of self-castigation, especially in the Marianite sodalities under Jesuit direction. In close touch with the Jesuits were also the French penitential and flagellant brotherhoods of the sixteenth century, which had much influence in the political life of France under King Henry III (1574–89). In Germany, too, owing mainly to the influence of the Jesuits and Capuchins, the self-castigation of laymen was again widely espoused in the sixteenth century. The most notable German scholar of the Jesuit Order, Jacob Gretscher (q.v.), compiled (1606–13) a comprehensive history and vindication of self-castigation, with a view to promoting its diffusion as widely as possible. Thanks again to the Jesuits' propaganda, flagellation celebrated brilliant triumphs, after the sixteenth century, in parts beyond Europe; especially in India, Persia, Japan, the Philippines, and particularly in the American provinces of Spain. Indeed even to the present day flagellation has stoutly asserted itself in South America, Mexico, and in the southwestern portion of the United States; the brotherhoods (*Hermanos penitentes*) of New Mexico and Colorado recently numbered their members by thousands, and pushed their fanaticism to the point of crucifying their members, insomuch that Leo XIII. felt prompted to interpose against their processions. In South America flagellation of laymen is still in many places a customary and regular practise, in specified churches, and according to ritual forms. In like manner the practise of self-castigation in public maintained itself to the nineteenth century and in some cases to quite recent date, in East India, the Azores and the Canary Islands, Italy, and the southern Tyrol. Flagellation of laymen in private at present is confined to somewhat narrow circles; thoroughgoing directions with regard to the most suitable kind of flagellation and the instruments to be applied are given by C. Capellmann in his *Pastoralmedicin* (12th ed., Aachen, 1898, p. 175). In the Greek Church flagellation has appeared only here and there in certain monastic circles. Some Russian sects, however, are said to practise it in their so-called services after a fashion reminding of the dervishes. Herman Haupt.

6. Later Manifestations and Developments.

Bibliography: I. E. G. Förstemann, *Die christlichen Geisslergesellschaften*, Halle, 1828 (antiquates most of the earlier literature); J. Morinus, *Commentarius historicus de disciplina in administratione pœnitentiæ . observata*, book vii., chap. 14, pp. 471 sqq., Antwerp, 1682; L. Holsten and M. Brockie, *Codex regularum monasticarum et canonicarum*, ii. 329, v. 98, 467, vi. 97, 161, 258, 276, 340, 523, Augsburg, 1759; Kober, in *TQ*, lvii (1875), 3 sqq., 355 sqq.; P. Hinschius, *System des katholischen Kirchenrechts*, iv. 737, 803, 814, v. 78, 547, 624, Berlin, 1887; H. C. Lea. *Hist. of Inquisition*, i. 272, 464, ii. 381 sqq., New York, 1906; idem, *Hist. of Auricular Confession* ii. 152–153, London, 1896; O. Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchthum*, Frankfort, 1897; W. M. Cooper, *Flagellation and the Flagellants*, London, 1898; A. Cabarès, *La Flagellation dans l'histoire et la littérature*, Paris, 1899; *Étude sur la Flagellation*, ib. 1899 (includes religious and primitive uses); J. Holmes, *Memoirs of Private Flagellation*, ib. 1899; A. Eulenberg, *Sadismus and Masochismus*, New York, 1902; *Hist. of Flagellation among Different Nations*, ib. 1904; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 221, iii. 253; *KL*, iii., 1819 sqq., 1532 sqq.

II. Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, vol. viii.; G. Lami, *Lezioni di antichità toscane*, pp. 613–671, Florence, 1766; G. B. Vermiglioli, *Storia e constituzioni della confraternita dei Nobili della Giustizia*, Perugia, 1846; A. Stumpf, *Historia flagellantium*, Halle, 1836; J. J. I. von Döllinger, in *Historisches Taschenbuch*, 1871, pp. 322 sqq.; E. Monaci, in *Rivista di filologia Romanza*, i (1872), 235 sqq.; R. Röhricht, *Bibliographische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Geissler*, in *ZKG*, i (1877), 313 sqq.; H. Haupt, *Religiöse Sekten in Franken*, Würzburg, 1882; idem, in *ZKG*, ix (1886), 114 sqq.; R. Höniger, *Der Schwarze Tod in Deutschland*, Berlin, 1882; C. Lechner, in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, v (1884), 438 sqq.; idem, *Die grosse Geisselfahrt des . 1349*, ib. v. 437–462; A. Gaspary. *Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur*, i. 141 sqq., Berlin, 1885; F. Hassaurek, *Vier Jahre unter den Spanish-Amerikanern*, pp. 141 sqq., Dresden, 1887; P. Fredericq, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis . . Neerlandicæ*, i. 190 sqq., ii. 96 sqq., Ghent, 1889–96; idem, *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden*, ii. 6 sqq., 1897; A. D'Ancona, *Origini del teatro italiano*, vol. i. passim, Turin, 1891; G. de Gregorio, *Capitoli della prima compagnia di disciplina di San Nicolò di Palermo*, Palermo, 1891; W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, i. 304 sqq., Halle, 1893; G. Mazzatinti, *Costituzioni dei disciplinati d. S. Andrea di Perugia*, Forli, 1893; P. Fage, *Hist. de S. Vincent Ferrier*, 2 vols., Paris, 1894; E. Michael, in *ZKT*, xxiii. (1899) 180–181; P. Runge, *Die Lieder und Melodien der Geissler*, Leipsic, 1900; G. Galli, *Disciplinanti dell'Umbria del 1260 e le loro Laudi*, supplement to *Giornale storico della letteratura Italiana*, Turin, 1906; P. Flade, in *Beiträge zur sächsischen Kirchengeschichte*, xi. 81 sqq.; G. B. Menapace, *Notizie storica intorno ai battuti del Trentino*, in *Archivio Trentino*, vols. ix.–x.; Neander, *Christian Church*, v. 412; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 788 sqq., v. 1, pp. 875 sqq.

FLATT, JOHANN FRIEDRICH. See Tübingen School, the Older.

FLATTICH, JOHANN FRIEDRICH: Swabian preacher and pedagogue; b. at Beihingen near Ludwigsburg (8 m. n. of Stuttgart) Oct. 3, 1713;

d. at Münchingen (7 m. n.w. of Stuttgart) June 1, 1797. He went through the usual course of study of the Württemberg theologians, became preacher in Hohenasperg in 1742, in Metterzimmern in 1747, and in Münchingen in 1760. Though he always remained a simple country parson, he possessed a marked personality, an original wit and a clear perception which in its judgment of men and things was remarkably accurate. He was sincere, upright, and courageous enough to tell the truth to the reigning duke and his courtiers. His theological position was that of Bengel, whose disciple he was, and he was as mild as his teacher and avoided all theological and churchly extremes, both of Pietism and of rationalism.

He is chiefly known as a teacher. Even while a student he began to instruct young people from pure love, and continued this activity until his old age. He usually had fifteen to twenty pupils in his home, children and youths from every class and destined for the most different vocations. His methods of teaching were entirely original. By the influence of his vital Christian personality, by the power of his forbearing, active, supplicating love, he made efficient men even from the most cankerous material. (H. Mosapp.)

Bibliography: K. F. Ledderhose, *Leben und Schriften von J. F. Flattich*, Heidelberg, 1873; idem, *Züge aus dem Leben des . J. F. Flattich*, Stuttgart, 1873; C. Schäfer, *Flattich's pädagogisches System*, Frankfort, 1871; P. Paulus, *J. F. Flattich, ein Sokrates unserer Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1875; G. Weitbreht, *J. F. Flattich's psychologische Beiträge zur Gymnasialpädagogik*, ib. 1873.

FLAVEL, JOHN: English Presbyterian; b. at Bromsgrove (12 m. s.s.w. of Birmingham), Worcestershire, c. 1630; d. at Exeter, Devonshire, June 26, 1691. He studied at Oxford and in 1650 became curate of Diptford, in Devonshire. In 1656 he removed to Dartmouth. On being deprived of his living in 1662 by the Act of Uniformity, he continued to preach privately until the Five Mile Act (1665) drove him from Dartmouth. He then retired to Slapton, five miles away, where he continued to preach. On the granting of the indulgence of 1671 he resumed his services at Dartmouth. Later the privilege of preaching was withdrawn from him and he was forced to seek safety in London. Afterward he returned to Dartmouth and met his people nightly at his own house, until in 1687, on the relaxation of the penal laws, they built a meeting-house for him. Flavel was a voluminous writer of popular works strongly Evangelical in sentiment, including, *Husbandry Spiritualized* (London, 1669); *Navigation Spiritualized* (1671); *A Saint Indeed* (1671); *The Fountain of Life Opened* (1672); *The Seaman's Companion* (1676); and *An Exposition of the Assembly's Catechism* (1693). There have been several collected editions of his works (new ed., 6 vols., London, 1820), and some of his writings are still reprinted as tracts.

Bibliography: The *Life* is prefixed to the collected edition of his *Works*. Consult: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iv. 323–326, London, 1820; S. Palmer, *Nonconformists' Memorial*, ii. 18–22, London, 1778.

FLAVIAN: The name of two bishops of Antioch.

1. Patriarch 381–404; b. in the early part of the fourth century; d. in Antioch June, 404. Of the sixty years of his life before he was consecrated bishop of Antioch in 381 little is known; Chrysostom states that he was the child of wealthy parents who died while he was still young. Despite his wealth he remained faithful to the ascetic ideal, and as an adherent of the Nicene party, to which he may have been converted by Eustathius (see Eustathius of Antioch), whose last sermon he heard, was one of the successful opponents of the Arianism of Bishop Leontius (344–357). At that period he evidently sided with the partizans of Eustathius, but after the formation of the neo-Nicene party Flavian joined it and during the banishment of Meletius (see Meletius of Antioch) he and his friend Diodorus (q.v.) directed the fortunes of the neo-Nicenes of Antioch with wise resistance to Arian teachings. In 378 Diodorus was consecrated bishop of Tarsus, and three years later Flavian accompanied Meletius to Constantinople, only to be chosen, after the sudden death of this bishop, his successor by the neo-Nicene majority in the First Council of Constantinople. This choice, however, resulted in many dissensions, the primary consequence being a revival of the Meletian schism (see Meletius of Antioch). Apart from this there is but scanty knowledge of his episcopate. He ordained both Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia to the priesthood, the former in 386, while in the following year he hastened to Constantinople in a successful endeavor to appease the emperor's anger at the affront shown him by the riotous citizens of Antioch who had mutilated the imperial statues. He emphasized the honor due to the saints, and was eager that they should be interred far from heretical graves. Flavian convened a synod of three other bishops and thirty priests and deacons to oppose the Messalians (q.v.), and Adelphius, one of their leaders, was condemned, with his followers, and excommunicated. He was still able to travel to Constantinople in 394. The precise day of his death is unknown, but it certainly was not Sept. 27, his festival in the Greek Church.

Except for an allusion of Photius to two letters of Flavian against the Messalians, one to the inhabitants of Osrhoene and the other to an Armenian bishop, only nine brief citations from nine homilies are known, seven of these being found in the *Eranistes* of Theodoret and two in Leontius of Byzantium. These fragments are sufficient, however, to show that he was Antiochian in dogmatics. The oration ascribed to him by Chrysostom as delivered before Theodosius is in great part, if not entirely, the invention of his pupil.

2. Bishop 498–512. See Monophysites.

(F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: Sources of knowledge are the *Hist. eccl.* of Theodoret and the writings of Chrysostom. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. x.; idem, *Histoire des empereurs*, vol. x. L.; E. Dupin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, iii. 6–7, Paris, 1693; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vi.3 10–316 et passim; *DCB*, ii. 527–531; *KL*, iv. 1544–46.

FLAVIAN OF CONSTANTINOPLE: Bishop of Constantinople; b. in the second half of the fourth century; d. at Hypepe in Lydia, 449. Little is known concerning him except his part in the Eutychian controversy (see Eutychian-

ism), although Theophanes and Nicephorus, apparently basing their statements on reliable tradition, say that before his consecration he was a presbyter and *skeuophylax* in Constantinople. Where he received his education is unknown, nor is his theological position absolutely determined either by the attacks made on him by Dioscurus of Alexandria, which were not necessarily theological in origin, or by his own opposition to Eutyches, which seems to have been inspired by Eusebius of Dorylæum. He was apparently Antiochian in his dogmatics, thus explaining the hostility of Chrysaphius, the Alexandrine favorite of the emperor. Flavian was finally condemned and deposed for his share in the Eutychian controversy by the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus in 449 and died shortly afterward. There is no evidence, however, that his death was other than natural, although the Greek Church reckons him a martyr, and celebrates his festival on Feb. 18. (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: Two of Flavian's letters against Eutyches are printed in the Acts of the Synod of Ephesus. Consult: *ASB*, Feb., iii. 71–79; *DCB*, ii. 532; *KL*, iv. 1542–1544; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vol. x., passim.

FLÉCHIER, ESPRIT: Bishop of Nîmes; b. at Pernes (10 m. n.e. of Avignon), in the county of Avignon, June 10, 1632; d. at Montpellier Feb. 16, 1710. His uncle, the learned monk Hercule Audiffret, educated him from 1648 to 1658 in the college of the Congrégation des Doctrinaires, of which he was director. After the death of his uncle Fléchier went to Paris and devoted himself to the art of poetry. He attracted some attention by a Latin poem on a grand tournament held by Louis XIV., but the lack of an influential patron forced him to take the position of a teacher in the country. Later he returned to Paris where he was active as pulpit orator and author. He attracted the attention of Louis XIV. and won his permanent favor. He became a rival of Bossuet, but his orations were at times too artificial and lacked great and high thoughts. He won lasting fame only by his funeral orations, that on Marshal Turenne (1676) being his masterpiece. In 1673 he became a member of the Academy, together with Racine. In 1685 he was made bishop of Lavaur, and in 1687 of Nîmes. As bishop he was greatly beloved, even by the Protestants who hid in his diocese, on account of his mildness and great benevolence. Besides his funeral oration on Turenne may be mentioned those on Lamoignon, president of the chamber (1679), on Queen Maria Theresia (1682), on Chancellor Le Tellier (1686), on Marie Anna, Dauphine of France (1690), and on his friend the Duke of Montausier (1690). He also wrote biographies of the Emperor Theodosius (Paris, 1679) and of Cardinal Ximenes (1693). Inferior in value are twenty-five orations on Advent and eight missionary and synodical speeches. His *Œuvres complètes* were published in ten volumes at Nîmes, 1782, and at Paris, 1828. (C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: A. Delacroix, *Hist. de Fléchier*, Paris, 1865; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, iv. 767–773 (elaborate); valuable material is found in the prefaces to his *Œuvres complètes*.

FLEET MARRIAGES: The name applied to a class of clandestine and more or less irregular marriages performed by chaplains of the Fleet Prison in London during the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. In order to regulate the disorders in regard to marriage which the Reformation had introduced, a law was passed under the Commonwealth (1653) permitting civil marriage before a justice of the peace. At the Restoration the earlier law was reestablished and strictly enforced; but clandestine marriages, avoiding the regular alternatives of banns or license, were still possible, since there were a number of churches in which on the plea of exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, the law could be disregarded. The Fleet Prison, or the territory legally held to belong to it, was a favorite place for these marriages. Disreputable clergymen here made a trade of marrying all comers, without respect to the fulfilment of any necessary conditions, and shameless competition among them led to the greatest laxity. From 1666 various attempts were made to suppress the evil, but it rather increased, until it was possible for one abandoned man, named John Gayhan, who was technically a prisoner there from 1701 to 1740, to boast that during that time he had performed 36,000 marriages. Finally in 1753 a bill was introduced into the House of Lords by Hardwicke, the Lord Chancellor, "for the better preventing of clandestine marriages," and became a law on June 6. Its working was not altogether satisfactory in detail, and later enactments, especially in 1823, were required to amend it, until a final settlement of all difficulties was made under William IV. in 1834 and 1836.

Bibliography: J. S. Burn, *The Fleet Registers, Comprising the History of Fleet Marriages*, London, 1834; H. B. Oppenheim, in *ZKR*, i (1861), 8–9; E. Friedberg, *Das Recht der Eheschliessung*, 309–310, 335–336, Leipsic, 1865; J. Ashton, *Fleet River, Prison, and Marriages*, London, 1888.

FLEETWOOD, JOHN: The name, probably assumed, under which was issued *The Life of Jesus Christ together with the Lives and Sufferings of his Holy Apostles, Evangelists, and Other Primitive Martyrs* (London, 1767 and often), a work which enjoyed great popularity until it was superseded by modern and more scholarly lives of Jesus. Two other volumes, *The Christian's Prayer Book, or Complete Manual of Devotions* (London, 1772) and *The Christian's Dictionary* (1775) are attributed to the same author.

FLEETWOOD, WILLIAM: English prelate; b. in London Jan. 1, 1656; d. at Tottenham (6 m. n.n.e. of St. Paul's, London) Aug. 4, 1723. He studied at Eton, and at King's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1679; M.A., 1683; D.D., 1705). Soon after taking orders he won renown by a sermon delivered before King's College, Mar. 25, 1689, in commemoration of Edward VI., the founder of the college. He was given a fellowship at Eton, the chapter rectory of St. Augustine and St. Faith's, London (Nov. 26, 1689), and soon afterward the lectureship of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West. He held liberal political views and favored the revolution. Shortly after the accession of William and Mary he was appointed chaplain to the king, and in 1702 canon of Windsor. In 1705 he exchanged his London

preferments for the living of Wexham in Buckinghamshire. Despite his opposition to her favorite political party, Queen Anne made him bishop of St. Asaph in 1708; and in 1714 Geo. I. translated him to the sce of Ely. For his attacks on the Jacobite tendencies of the Tory government in 1712 he was threatened with impeachment and the House of Commons voted that the preface of a volume of sermons he had just published be burned by the public hangman. Besides a number of sermons and charges to the clergy, Fleetwood's works include, *Inscriptionum antiquarium sylloge* (London, 1691), a collection of Christian and pagan inscriptions; *An Essay on Miracles* (1701); and *Chronicon pretiosum* (1707), an investigation of the value of money and commodities for the previous six centuries. His sermons may be found in his *Works* (London, 1737; new ed., 3 vols., Oxford, 1854).

Bibliography: A *Memoir*, by Fleetwood's nephew, W Powell, is prefixed to his *Works*. Consult: J. H. Monk, *Life of Dr. Richard Bentley*, i. 367–370, ii. 88, 247, London, 1833; *Biographia Britannica*, vol. ii., ib. 1750; *DNB*, xix. 269–271.

FLEMING, DAVID HAY: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at St. Andrews, Scotland, May 9, 1849. He studied at Madras College, St. Andrews, 1854–66, and then engaged in business until he retired in 1883 to devote himself to the study of Scotch history. In 1904–06 he was lecturer on church history in New College, Edinburgh. In theology he is an old-school Presbyterian and a stanch Calvinist. Among his writings those of theological interest are *The Martyrs and Confessors of St. Andrews* (Cupar-Fife, 1887); *Mary Queen of Scots from her Birth to her Flight into England* (London, 1897); *The Scottish Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1903); and *The Story of the Scottish Covenants in Outline* (1904). He has also edited *Register of the Ministers, Elders, and Deacons of the Christian Congregation of St. Andrews, Comprising the Proceedings of the Kirk Session and of the Court of the Superintendent of Fife, Fothrik, and Strathearn, 1559–1600* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1889–90); A. F. Mitchell's *Scottish Reformation* (Baird Lectures for 1899, 1900); and Patrick Walker's *Six Saints of the Covenant* (2 vols., London, 1901).

FLEMING (less correctly **Flemming**), **PAUL:** German poet; b. at Hartenstein (9 m. s.e. of Zwickau) in the Saxon Vogtland, Oct. 5, 1609 (old style); d. at Hamburg Apr. 2, 1640. When about twelve years of age, he entered the Thomasschule at Leipsic, and in 1628 began his studies at the university. Along with his professional course in medicine, he occupied himself with dialectics, rhetoric, and poetics; and in 1633 became doctor of philosophy. In 1633–39 he made a journey to Persia, as attaché of an embassy despatched by Duke Frederick III. of Holstein. The travelers' remarkable experiences were described by Olearius in his *Beschreibung der neuen orientalischen Reise* (Sleswick, 1647). After his return, Fleming was graduated in Leyden as doctor of medicine. On the way thence to Reval, where he was intending to settle as physician, he fell ill and died at Hamburg, probably in consequence of hardships endured on the journey. He is buried in St. Catherine's Church at Hamburg.

Fleming is one of the most noteworthy German poets. His style is influenced by Opitz (whom he knew personally at Leipsic), but he is perfectly independent in the contents of his poems. These refer, for the most part, to his personal experiences, and are the natural expression of his deep and genuine sensibilities. They enable us to accompany him through his brief and stirring life, and reveal him as a believing Christian and highly cultivated noble man. He wrote in the Latin language quite as aptly and freely as in his mother tongue. The best known of his poems is the hymn, *In allen meinen Thaten lass ich den Höchsten rathen* (Eng. transl. by Miss Winkworth, " Where'er I go, whate'er my task), which he composed prior to departing for Persia. The edition of Fleming's poems prepared, at his own request, by Olearius after his death (Hamburg, 1641) contains only a small selection of the German poems. So, too, an edition that appeared at Lübeck in 1642 is very defective. The first accurate edition is by J. M. Lappenberg, *Paul Flemings lateinische Gedichte* (Stuttgart, 1863). and *Deutsche Gedichte* (2 vols., 1865).

Carl Bertheau.

Bibliography: J. Moller, *Cimbria literata*, ii. 193 sqq., Copenhagen, 1744; C. H. Jördens, *Lexikon deutscher Dichter*, i. 544 sqq., v. 97 sqq., 6 vols., Leipsic, 1806–11; K. A. Varnhagen von Ense, *Biographische Denkmale*, iv. 1–168, Berlin, 1846 (gives account of Fleming's travels); J. M. Lappenberg, *Paul Flemings lateinische Gedichte*, Stuttgart, 1863; idem, *Deutsche Gedichte*, ii. 851–894, ib. 1865 (the basis of Tittmann); J. Tittmann, *Gedichte von Paul Fleming*, Leipsic, 1870; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesang*, iii. 73–82, 8 vols., Stuttgart, 1866–77; *ADB*, xii. 115 sqq.; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 378–379.

FLESH.

Biblical Usage. The Problem of Interpretation (§ 1).
The Hebrew *Basar* (§ 2).
" Flesh " Equivalent to " Man " (§ 3).
Jewish Usage (§ 4).
New Testament Usage (§ 5).
Paul (§ 6).

The Bible has different representations of man's material nature. The term " flesh " is always used with reference to man's body; so that Chrysostom's comment on Gal. v. 16 is anything but precise—" The flesh (Gk. *sarx*) is not the body, nor the essence of the body, but the evil disposition, the earthly, lustful, and lawless reason." The same is true of Julius Müller's definition,—" The flesh is the tendency or inclination of human life turned away from God, the life and movement of man in the midst of the things of this visible world." The flesh is regarded as endowed with mind (Gk. *phronēma*, Rom. viii. 6), desire or lust (*epithymia*, Gal. v. 16; I John ii. 16), will (*thelēma*, Eph. ii. 3), etc., and can not, therefore, stand for a disposition of the will. *Sarx* designates, not a tendency or disposition of the flesh, but the flesh itself with that disposition. But a problem arises,—how can *sarx* be considered the subjective cause of such disposition while usually *kardia* (" heart ") is looked upon as the seat of the will (Matt. xv. 10; Rom. i. 24)?

1. Biblical Usage. The Problem of Interpretation.

This difficulty can not be solved by the perception that man himself as the subjective cause of such disposition may be designated as flesh because he is represented in it; for *sarx* does not in the Bible always mean man himself, but that which shapes him, his guiding principle (cf. Rom. vii. 14, with verses 18 and 25); this observation, however, leads to a correct understanding of the difficulty.

It is necessary to go back to the Old Testament *basar*, and especially to *basar* in the sense of *sarx*, in which it is used only of the flesh of man, while it is used in the sense of *kreas* only with regard to animals (i.e., the flesh of sacrifice). In this special application to man *basar* means in the first place the substance of the body. The bones or blood are sometimes mentioned with flesh, as constituting the body (Luke xxiv. 39; I Cor. xv. 50). By synecdoche flesh is used for the body (Ps. xvi. 9; Cor. x. 3). This use of the term is a Hebrew idiom, foreign to the Greek; so that the Septuagint often translates the Hebrew *basar* by *sōma* (" body "). The expression " all flesh " is sometimes used for the race in its totality (Gen. vi. 17), but usually for the race as human (Gen. vi. 12; Luke iii. 6, etc.).

2. The Hebrew *Basar.*

This leads to the peculiarity of the Biblical use of the word. It designates man because man appears through it, and manifests his nature by it; in the flesh man has his life—he is flesh. This attribute he shares with the whole living universe. Flesh is the condition and outward expression of its existence; by the flesh it manifests its solidarity. Thus, as flesh, it is weak and frail (Ps. lxxviii. 39). Flesh is not spirit, nor vital power (Isa. xxxi. 3), but stands in living and moral contrast to spirit, the spirit of God (Deut. v. 26).

3. " Flesh " Equivalent to " Man."

Thus in the Old Testament the term " flesh " connects itself with the conception of impotence, need of salvation, and sinfulness of man whose distinction from God is the distinction between flesh and spirit. The development of the term in the New Testament and especially in Paul may be traced directly to this Old Testament conception, while the development of the term in the synagogue was quite different.

The most significant traits of the Old Testament representation practically disappear in the Apocrypha. *Sarx* is spoken of as the substance of the human body (Sirach xix. 12, xliv. 20; Judith xiv. 10 etc.). *Pasa sarx* occurs with the same meaning as in the Old Testament (Sirach i. 8, xiii. 15; Judith ii. 3; etc.). But the idea of lowliness and frailty disappeared almost altogether, likewise the idea of distinction from God. The same may be said of the Pseudepigrapha and the remaining post-Biblical literature of the synagogue. Alexandrianism accepted the Old Testament meaning as little as did the theologians of the synagogue. The Septuagint perverted in important passages (Num. xvi. 22; Isa. xxxi. 3) the relation of spirit or God and flesh into the distinction between spirit and matter. Philo uses *sarx* in the sense of evil disposition. This is not a translation of Biblical views into Alexandrinian philosophy, but it is most clearly a translation of the synagogal view of the *yeẓer ha-ra'*, the evil disposition, the disposition toward the sensual from which the real evil has proceeded.

4. Jewish Usage.

On this account it is the more peculiar that the writers of the New Testament—Paul not excepted—have not built on this later foundation, but have gone back to the Old Testament. In the synoptic Gospels and in Acts *sarx* designates the substance of the body (Luke xxiv. 39; Acts ii. 26, 31), man and humanity (Matt. xix. 5, 6; Mark x. 8; etc.). It denotes the distinction from God and that not in the physical sense, hence the incongruous relation of *sarx* to the divine principle of life in the heart of man (Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 31). The writings of John and Peter, the Epistle of Jude, and the Epistle to the Hebrews do not add any essential features except that " flesh " also indicates the peculiarity of man's external nature. Thus it is opposed to *pneuma*, or spirit (Col. ii. 1, 5).

5. New Testament Usage.

In the writings of Peter the contrast between *sarx* and *pneuma* appears as a contrast of *sarx* and the spirit of God (I Pet. iii. 18), and as a contrast of *sarx* and the human *pneuma* (I Pet. iv. 6). The same contrast between God or the spirit of God and the flesh dominates the use of the word in the writings of John. Here the expression " The Word was made flesh " (John i. 14) has its force from the contrast with (verse 1) " The Word was God." The same contrast appears in Ps. lvi. 5, 2; Chron. xxxii. 8; II Cor. xiii. 4. *Sarx* in distinction from God and his spirit denotes frailty, helplessness, need of salvation.

The sinfulness of the flesh is emphasized by Paul (Rom. viii. 3). In this sense he calls the body " a body of the flesh " *sōma tēs sarkos* (Col. ii. 11), and life a " walking in the flesh " (II Cor. x. 3). Corresponding to the peculiarity of the New Testament revelation of salvation, the Old Testament contrast between God and man, flesh and spirit, has developed into the contrast between *sarx* and the *pneuma hagion*. In connection with the latter contrast Paul defines the relation between *sarx* and sin in so far as with the former and through it there adheres to man an evil disposition, a being sold unto sin (Rom. vii. 14). Man is dominated by sin; it lives in and through him. It was therefore easy for Chrysostom to identify *sarx* with an evil disposition or for Neander to define it as " human nature in its alienation from God." In a similar way Holsten maintained that for Paul *sarx* was the material, sensual substance in contrast with *pneuma* as the immaterial, spiritual and Divine substance. In the *sarx* and *pneuma* of Paul there is, according to Holsten, the opposition of the finite and the infinite, evil and good, so that in Pauline theology sin was a necessity. The whole Pauline view of the world, according to him, forms a dualism which has its root in the Jewish and Hellenistic view of the world. But it has been shown above that the thoughts of Paul as well as the other writings of the New Testament are in no way dependent upon the

6. Paul.

development in the later synagogue or Alexandrian philosophy, but have developed directly from the Old Testament. This phenomenon shows itself also in other important points of the New Testament dispensation and compels the assumption of a double tendency in religious thought,—the one represented and influenced by the synagogue as a theological school and its mode of expression, laid down in the Old Testament Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the Talmudic writings as well as in Philo, the other starting directly from the Old Testament and known through the New Testament.

If this be conceded, much has been gained for the decision of the question. Passages like Rom. vii. 14–15 show the strongest contrast to the later synagogal conception of *sarx*. Whenever Paul speaks of *sarx*, he means present reality, and does not denote by it the source and cause of sin in the world. The *sarx* is the seat of sin and not the cause of its existence; it is chained to life and propagates itself through it and with it in a way which has originated not through God, but through the fall. Therefore with life impotence and death propagate themselves and with them the inability to lead a life pleasing to God and the tendency toward the contrary, " enmity against God " (Rom. viii. 7, 8). We are what we are and as we are through the flesh, we are in the flesh, in its power instead of in that of the Spirit,—we are flesh. But this evidently does not mean that flesh is the source of sin, it does not even mean that the flesh in distinction from the other parts of the human being is the seat of sin; for everything, even the heart, the seat of the origin of sin, pertains to man through the flesh, or, as we might say, to the flesh itself. Since sin is in the world, there are only sinners born by the flesh, and thus the apostle may distinguish between *nous* and *sarx* as he does in Rom. vii. 25.

Thus there is no reason why *sarx* should mean human nature. It rather means the flesh in its peculiar nature as it has been implanted into man by the fall. Even Christ appeared " in the likeness of sinful flesh " (Rom. viii. 3), an expression which denotes not the difference but the agreement with our case. He entered into the flesh with all the consequences of sin or the fall (Col. i. 22; Heb. ii. 14); but his own spiritual nature overcame, so to speak, at the very beginning, its disposition to sin. See Soul and Spirit. (H. Cremer†.)

Bibliography: F. Delitzsch, *System der biblischen Psychologie*, Leipsic, 1855, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1867; J. J. van Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, ii. 365, 398, 659, New York, 1874; H. H. Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch*, Gotha, 1878; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, §§ 27, 67, 68, 86, 100, 115, 124, 128, 139, 145, Edinburgh, 1882–83; W. P. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*, London, 1883; O. Zöckler, *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, i. 342 sqq., 347 sqq., iii. 307, 531–532, Nördlingen, 1889, Munich, 1890; O. Pfleiderer, *Der Paulinismus*, pp. 60–78, Leipsic, 1890; H. Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, i. 399, ii. 112, 242 sqq., 300–301, 314–315, Edinburgh, 1892; J. Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, pp. 109–120, 270–274, ib. 1895; W. Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, i. 88, 91, 228, ii. 28, 38, 42 sqq., ib. 1896; G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 189–190, 338–339, New York, 1899; A. B. Davidson, *Theology of the Old Testament*, pp. 188–192, ib. 1904; and the lexicons.

FLETCHER, GILES (called the Younger, to distinguish him from his father—b. about 1549; d. 1611—also known as a poet): English divine and religious poet; b. in London c. 1588; d. at Alderton (11 m. e.s.e. of Ipswich), Suffolk, 1623. He was educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1606), where he became a minor fellow in 1608, reader in Greek grammar in 1615, and reader in the Greek language in 1618. Soon afterward he left the university and became rector at Alderton, Suffolk. Fletcher is known principally by the poem, *Christ's Victory and Triumph in Heaven and Earth over and after Death* (2 parts, Cambridge, 1610; modern editions, London, 1869, 1876, by A. B. Grosart, 1888, 1899, etc.) which has been called one of the most remarkable religious poems in the language. It undoubtedly furnished Milton with valuable suggestions, which he utilized in *Paradise Regained*. Fletcher published also *The Reward of the Faithful* (London, 1623), a theological treatise in prose.

Bibliography: Consult the Preface by A. B. Grosart to his edition of the *Poems*, London, 1876; *DNB*, xix. 302.

FLETCHER, JOHN WILLIAM (FLETCHER OF MADELEY): Associate of John Wesley and one of the most pious and useful ministers of his generation; b. at Nyon (on the Lake of Geneva, 21 m. s.w. of Lausanne), Canton of Vaud, Switzerland, Sept. 12, 1729; d. at Madeley (13 m. e. s.e. of Shrewsbury), Shropshire, Aug. 14, 1785. His name was originally De la Fléchère. He was a fine scholar in his youth, and took all the prizes at the school in Geneva which he attended. He was designed by his parents for the ministry, but preferred the army. Against their wishes he went to Lisbon and enlisted, but was prevented from going to Brazil by an accident which confined him for some time to his bed. The vessel was lost at sea. Fletcher returned to Switzerland, but, not disheartened, went to Flanders at the invitation of his uncle, who promised to secure a commission in the army for him. The sudden death of his relative, and the termination of the war, again interfered with his plans. He then went to England, and became tutor in the family of Thomas Hill, of Shropshire, in 1752.

Early Life.

A new period soon began in Fletcher's history. He heard the Methodists. Their language about faith was a new revelation to him, and in 1755 he united with one of their societies. In 1757 he was ordained priest by the bishop of Bangor. During the next few years he preached occasionally for John Wesley and others, and became known as a public supporter of the great religious revival. In 1760 he accepted the living of Madeley, against the advice of Wesley, with whom, however, he preserved a lifelong friendship.

For twenty-five years, with the exception of the interval between 1776 and 1781, when ill health forced him to take a respite from work, Fletcher labored at Madeley with singular devotion and zeal. He preached with great fervor the plain truths of the Gospel, and labored incessantly during the week to awaken sinners. It was his

Vicar of Madeley.

custom to rise at five o'clock Sabbath morning, and go through the neighborhood ringing a bell, that no one might be able to give as an excuse for non-attendance at church that he was not aroused in time. He visited worldly entertainments, and with the fearlessness of John Knox preached to the astounded revelers upon the folly of forbidden pleasures. Great and blessed results followed such fidelity. In 1768 he was called to preside over Lady Huntingdon's College at Trevecca, Wales, and accepted, the call requiring only occasional visitation, not continuous residence. The discussion over Calvinism and Arminianism among the Methodists led him to resign in 1771.

As a preacher, Fletcher directed his appeals to the conscience. He was well trained, and had a fine voice. As a man, he was characterized by saintly piety, rare devotion, and blamelessness of life. In the judgment of Southey, "no age ever produced a man of more fervent piety, or more perfect charity, and no church ever possessed a more apostolic minister," and Wesley characterized him as the holiest man he had ever met, or ever expected to meet "this side of eternity."

His Theology and Writings.

In theology, Fletcher was an Arminian of Arminians. Most of his writings are directed against Calvinism, were written to defend Wesley, and grew out of controversies with Toplady and Rowland Hill. Some of these works are still extensively circulated, and are authoritative in the Methodist churches. However, controversial as his writings are, Fletcher was not a polemist, but always treated his opponents with fairness and courtesy, and in this presented a marked contrast to Toplady and to John Wesley. He was also a millenarian (cf. his letter to John Wesley, Nov. 29, 1755). He sympathized with Wesley's views concerning the revolt of the American colonies and wrote two tracts to show that "the right of taxing subjects, with or without their consent, is an inseparable appendage of supreme government," viz., *A Vindication of Mr. Wesley's "Calm Address to Our American Colonies"* (London, 1776) and *American Patriotism Farther Confronted with Reason, Scripture, and the Constitution* (Shrewsbury, 1776). These writings were read at court and opened the way to high preferment, which he refused to consider. His principal works were *Checks to Antinomianism*, called forth by the dispute in 1771, and *The Portrait of St. Paul, or the True Model for Christians and Pastors*, translated from a French manuscript after Fletcher's death, with a notice of the author (2 vols., Shrewsbury, 1790). The first complete edition of his works appeared in London, 8 vols., 1803; there is a four-volume edition issued by the Methodist Book Concern in New York.

D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: The principal biography is by J. Benson, 4th ed., London, 1817. Other lives are by L Tyerman, ib. 1882; F. W Macdonald, ib. 1885; J. Marratt, ib. 1902; *DNB*, xix. 312–314. Consult also: A. Stevens, *History of . . Methodism*, 3 vols., New York, 1858–61; J. C. Ryle, *Christian Leaders of the Last Century*, pp. 383–423, London, 1869; F J. Snell, *Wesley and Methodism*, Edinburgh, 1900.

FLETCHER, JOSEPH: English independent; b. at Chester Dec. 3, 1784; d. at Stepney, London, June 8, 1843. He attended the grammar-school at Chester, then studied at Hoxton, and at the University of Glasgow (M.A., 1807; D.D., 1830). He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Blackburn 1807–23, and at the same time (after 1816) tutor in theology at Blackburn College. In 1823 he became pastor at Stepney. He was chairman of the Congregational Union in 1837 Fletcher was a voluminous writer and a regular contributor to the newly established *Eclectic Review*. His works include: *Spiritual Blessings* (Blackburn, 1814; 6th ed., London, 1891); *Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion* (London, 1817), which received generous praise; *Personal Election and Divine Sovereignty* (1825), also favorably received; and *Poems* (1846), in collaboration with his sister, Mary Fletcher. His *Select Works and Memoirs* (3 vols., 1846) were edited by his son, Joseph Fletcher of Hanley.

FLEURY, ABBEY OF: Formerly a celebrated Benedictine abbey at Fleury-sur-Loire in the diocese of Orléans and 20 m. e.s.e. of the city. It was founded by Abbot Leodebod of St. Anian, later bishop of Orléans, in the early part of the reign of Clovis II (638–657). The body of St. Benedict was brought here about 653, and this obtained many privileges for the abbey and made it a center of pilgrimage from all parts of Europe. The community was reformed by Odo of Cluny, and it became a famous seat of discipline and learning, which contributed not a little to the support of Dunstan's reforms in England. The school remained in great esteem until the sixteenth century, sometimes having as many as 5,000 pupils, and the library was exceedingly valuable until it was in part scattered by the zeal of the Huguenots (1561). Many of the manuscripts are now preserved in the municipal library of Orléans. Ultimately the monks associated themselves with the congregation of Saint Maur (q.v.).

Bibliography: *Chronicon Floriacense*, in A. Duchesne, *Historiæ Francorum script.*, iii. 355 sqq., Paris, 1640, abbreviated in *MGH., Script.*, ii (1829), 254 sqq.; *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 1538; Cuissard-Gaucheron, *L'École de Fleury-sur-Loire*, in *Mémoires de la société archéologique de l'Orléanais*, xiv (1875), 551 sqq.; *KL*, iv. 1554–57.

FLEURY, CLAUDE: French historian and ecclesiastic; b. at Paris Dec. 6, 1640; d. there July 14, 1723. He was educated at the college of Clermont, studied law, and for nine years practised as an advocate at Paris, where in 1674 he published his *Histoire du droit français*. Following the bent of his contemplative nature, however, and influenced by such men as Bossuet, he took orders, and was appointed tutor to the princes of Conti (1672), the count of Vermandois (1680), and the dukes of Burgoyne, Anjou, and Berry (1689). In 1683 he received the Cistercian abbey of Locdien in Rhodes, and was elected to the Academy in 1696 as the successor of La Bruyère. He declined the proffered see of Montpellier, but in 1706 accepted from Louis XIV the priory of Nôtre Dame d'Argenteuil, where he remained until 1716, when he was recalled to court as the confessor of Louis XV. This position

he resigned in 1722, the year before his death. Fleury's reputation rests chiefly upon his *Histoire ecclésiastique* (20 vols., Paris, 1691–1720), a history of the Church to 1414, written with much detail and moderation of tone from a standpoint of pronounced Gallicanism, but marred by a lack of critical acumen. It was continued to 1778 by Jean Claude Faber and Alexandre la Croix, though with less happy results. In the middle of the nineteenth century the manuscript of Fleury's own continuation to 1517 was discovered at Paris and published in the latest edition of the entire work (*Histoire ecclésiastique par l'Abbé Fleury, augmentée de quatre livres*, 6 vols., Paris, 1640), but is far inferior in value to the preceding part of the work.

For his pupils, Fleury wrote *Les Mœurs des Israélites* (Paris, 1681; Eng. transl., *The Manners of the Christians, with Biographical Notes*, Oxford, 1872); *Les Mœurs des Chrétiens* (1682); and *Grand catéchisme historique* (1679). His *Institution au droit ecclésiatique* (Paris, 1692), like his *Discours sur les libertés de l'église gallicane* (1690), is permeated by a spirit of firm Gallicanism. His pedagogical system was developed in his *Traité du choix et de la méthode des études* (1675). The minor works of Fleury were collected in his *Opuscules* (5 vols., Nîmes, 1780–81).

(Eugène Choisy.)

Bibliography: Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. viii.; L. E. Dupin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, vol. xviii., 35 vols., Paris, 1689–1711; F. R. Guettée, *Histoire de l'église de France*, vols. x., xi., 12 vols., Paris, 1847–56; L. Genay, *Un Pédagogue oublié du xviie siècle*, Paris, 1879.

FLICKINGER, DANIEL KUMLER: United Brethren in Christ; b. at Sevenmile, O., May 25, 1824. He was educated at Germantown Academy and was elected corresponding secretary of the United Brethren Church Missionary Society in 1857, being reelected quadrennially until 1885, when he was chosen foreign missionary bishop. He has been to Africa twelve times and to Germany five times on missionary tours, and has done much work upon the frontiers of the United States, and also among the Chinese. He is the author of *Off-hand Sketches in Africa* (Dayton, O., 1857); *Sermons* (in collaboration with Rev. W. J. Shuey; 1859); *Ethiopia: or, Twenty-six Years of Missionary Life in Western Africa* (1877); *The Church's Marching Orders* (1879); and *Our Missionary Work from 1853 to 1889* (1889).

Bibliography: D. K. Flickinger, *Fifty-five Years of Active Ministerial Life; Preface by Bishop G. M. Mathews*, Dayton, 1907.

FLIEDNER, flîd'ner, **FRITZ:** The "apostle of the gospel in Spain," son of Theodor Fliedner (q.v.); b. at Kaiserswerth on the Rhine, June 10, 1845; d. at Madrid Apr. 25, 1901. He studied at Halle and Tübingen, and became teacher in a school at Hilden 1868 and chaplain to the legation of the German Empire at Madrid and evangelist in Spain 1870. Besides editing *Blätter aus Spanien*, *Revista Christiana*, and *Amigo de la infancia*, he published (in Spanish) lives of Livingstone, Luther, his father, John Howard, Elizabeth Fry, a hymn-book for Sunday Schools, and various other books of Spanish Christian literature. He also published *Blätter und Blüthen*, poems (Heidelberg, 1885–97), *Römische Missionspraxis auf den Karolinen* (1889); *Erzählungen aus Spanien* (1895), *Aus meinem Leben, Erinnerungen und Erfahrungen* (Berlin, 1900).

Bibliography: Consult, besides the last work mentioned above, F. G. J. Grape, *Spanien und das Evangelium*, Halle, 1896.

FLIEDNER, THEODOR: German philanthropist, founder of the Kaiserswerth Deaconesses' Institute and the modern Protestant order of deaconesses (see Deaconess, III., 2, a); b. at Epstein (7 m. n.e. of Wiesbaden), in Nassau, Jan. 21, 1800; d. at Kaiserswerth (on the Rhine, 6 m. n.n.w. of Düsseldorf) Oct. 4, 1864. He was the son of a clergyman and was himself a plain, unpretending German pastor, of great working power, indefatigable zeal, fervent piety, and rare talent of organization. He studied at Giessen, Göttingen, and Herborn and for a year was tutor in a family at Cologne and had begun to doubt his fitness for the ministry, when he received and accepted, in Nov., 1821, what he considered a providential call, from a small Protestant colony at Kaiserswerth, then a Roman Catholic town of 1,800 inhabitants. The failure of a silk manufactory, upon which the town depended largely for support, led him to undertake, in the spring of 1822, a collecting tour to keep his struggling congregation alive. By the end of a week he returned with 1,200 thalers. This was the beginning of much greater things. By experience and perseverance he became one of the greatest beggars in the service of Christ. In 1823 he made a tour of Holland and England, which not only resulted in a permanent endowment of his congregation, but suggested to him the idea of his benevolent institutions. "In both these Protestant countries," he relates, "I became acquainted with a multitude of charitable institutions for the benefit both of body and soul. I saw schools and other educational organizations, almhouses, orphanages, hospitals, prisons, and societies for the reformation of prisoners, Bible and missionary societies, etc.; and at the same time I observed that it was a living faith in Christ which had called almost every one of these institutions and societies into life, and still preserved them in activity. This evidence of the practical power and fertility of such a principle had a most powerful influence in strengthening my own faith."

Fliedner made two more journeys to Holland, England, and Scotland (1832 and 1853), in the interest no more of his congregation, but of his institutions. He also visited the United States in 1849 and assisted in founding the Deaconesses' Institute in Pittsburg with Dr. Passavant at its head (see Deaconess, III. 2, d, § 1; Passavant, William Alfred). Twice he traveled to the East,—in 1851 to aid Bishop Gobat in founding a house of deaconesses in Jerusalem, and again in 1857, when he was, however, too feeble to proceed farther than Jaffa. King Frederick William IV. of Prussia and Queen Elizabeth took the most cordial interest in his labors for the sick and poor, furnished him liberally with means, and founded in 1847 the Bethany hospital with deaconesses at Berlin after the model of Kaiserswerth. In the

parsonage garden at Kaiserswerth there still stands the little summer-house, with one room of ten feet square, and an attic over it, which was the first refuge for released female prisoners and magdalen asylum, the humble cradle of all Fliedner's institutions. In 1849 Fliedner resigned his pastorate to devote all his time to his institutions. One of his last acts was to consecrate nineteen sisters, the largest number up to that time to go out from Kaiserswerth in a single year. At his death the number of deaconesses connected with Kaiserswerth and its daughter institutions exceeded 400 (see DEACONESS, III., 2). Fliedner's most important publications were several books descriptive of his travels and *Das Buch der Märtyrer der evangelischen Kirche* (4 vols., Kaiserswerth, 1852–60). He founded the *Christlicher Volkskalender*, which was widely popular.

(PHILIP SCHAFF†.) D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief "Life" is by his son, G. Fliedner, *T. Fliedner, kurzer Abriss seines Lebens und Wirkens*, 3d ed., Kaiserswerth, 1892. Consult: P. Schaff, *Germany, its Universities, Theology, and Religion*, chap. xxxviii., Philadelphia, 1857; *Dr. T. Fliedner, ein Charakter- und Lebensbild*, Barmen, 1865; *Life of Pastor Fliedner of Kaiserswerth*, transl. from the Germ. by Catharine Winkworth, London, 1867; T. Schäfer, *Weibliche Diakonie*, 3 vols., 2d ed., Stuttgart, 1887–94.

FLIESTEDEN, PETER. See KLARENBACH, ADOLF.

FLINT, ROBERT: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Dumfries, Scotland, Mar. 14, 1838. He was educated at Glasgow University (1852–59) and was parish minister at East Church, Aberdeen (1859–1862), and at Kilconquhar (1862–64). He was professor of moral philosophy and political economy at St. Andrews University (1864–76) and professor of divinity at Edinburgh University (1876–1903). He was also Baird Lecturer (1876–77), Stone Lecturer at Princeton (1880) and Croall Lecturer at Edinburgh (1887–88). He has written: *Christ's Kingdom on Earth* (Edinburgh, 1865); *Philosophy of History in Europe* (1874); *Theism* (1877); *Anti-Theistic Theories* (1879); *Vico* (1884); *Historical Philosophy in France, Belgium, and Switzerland* (1894); *Socialism* (London, 1894); *Sermons and Addresses* (Edinburgh, 1899); *Agnosticism* (1903); *Philosophy as Scientia Scientiarum and History of Classification of Science* (1904); and *On Theological, Biblical, and other Subjects* (1905).

FLODOARD, flō″dō″ār′, **OF REIMS:** French writer of the tenth century; b. at Épernay (17 m. s.s.e. of Reims) 893 or 894; d. 966. He studied in Reims, which in the tenth century formed the center of French politics and of the higher studies of Lorraine, and under Archbishop Herivæus (900–922) became canon in the cathedral. Owing to political disturbances, he lost his position and joined Bishop Artold (932–961). The latter sent him in 936 to Rome where he was favorably received by Pope Leo VII. and consecrated priest. When Artold lost his bishopric, Flodoard fled with him to Archbishop Rotbert of Treves (931–956). Flodoard took part in the Synod of Ingelheim in 948, at which Artold was reinstated by Pope Agapetus II. As a recompense for his faithfulness Artold gave him the position of keeper of the records in the church of Reims. In 751 he was entrusted with a mission to King Otho I.; in 952 he was appointed bishop of Tournay, but owing to unfavorable conditions could not enter his new position. In 963 he retired into the monastery of St. Basle. During his stay at Rome Flodoard was induced to write a hexameter poem in three parts on the "Triumphs of Christ and the Saints," which with much show of learning and piety tells of the spread of Christianity and the history of the popes. He compiled a chronicle (*Annales*; in *MGH, Script.*, iii., 1839, pp. 363–407; also, ed. P Lauer, Paris, 1906) of his own time, from 919 to 966, which is a source of valuable information for the history of Lorraine and the relations between the French and Germans of that time, and is indispensable for dates of numerous events. He also wrote a reliable and extensive *Historia Remensis* (in *MGH, Script.*, xiii., 1882, pp. 405–599) up to 948.

WILHELM ALTMANN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *ASM*, v. 325–332; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vi. 313, Paris, 1742; J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, p. 274, Carlsruhe, 1840; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 378–380, ii. 490, i (1893), 409–411; P. Scheffer-Boichorst, in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, viii. 423–430, Innsbruck, 1887. Consult also R. Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 841–844.

FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF. See FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.

FLORENSIANS (*Ordo Florensis*; **Order of Flore**): A Roman Catholic order established at Flore (the modern San Giovanni in Fiore, 90 m. s.w. of Taranto) by the Cistercian abbot and prophet Joachim (see JOACHIM OF FIORE) about 1192, some three years after he had exchanged the administration of his monastery of Corazzo for the life of a hermit in Mount Sila. For the inmates of his monastery of St. John, Joachim formed rules which were similar to those of the Cistercians, although independent and constituting a stricter Benedictine reform. This rule received the sanction of Celestine III. on Aug. 25, 1196, and there were also secular patrons, such as Henry VI. and his wife Constantia. The order gradually received several monasteries in Naples and both Calabrias, although it was exposed to persecution, since its founder was suspected of heresy. The miracles believed to be wrought at the tomb of Joachim gave a speedy impetus to the Florensians, so that they soon had thirty-four houses, including four nunneries, the most important at St. Helena near Amalfi. In 1227 Gregory IX. forbade the Cistercians to admit Florensians into their order on account of the comparative laxity of the Cistercian rule, thus rousing the envy and enmity of the monks of Cîteaux. The Florensians maintained their high position, however, until the appointment of abbots *in commendam*, the first in 1470. The order then declined, and the majority of its monasteries, like the mother house in 1505, became incorporated with the Cistercians, although a few joined the Dominicans and Carthusians. The habit of the Florensians was of coarse gray cloth and closely resembled that of the Cistercians. The monks went barefoot, and in choir wore a cowl over their habit. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

Bibliography: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, v. 392 sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. 267–268.

FLORENTIUS RADEWYNS, rā'dê-wins: One of the founders of the Brethren of the Common Life (q.v.); b. at Leerdam (13 m. s. of Utrecht), Holland, in 1350; d. at Deventer March 24, 1400. The son of educated, wealthy parents, he studied at the University of Prague from 1375 to 1378, when he received the degree of licentiate. On his return to Leerdam he heard Geert Groote (q.v.) preach, and the two became friends about 1380. He then exchanged his canonry at Utrecht for a vicarage at Deventer that he might be able to accompany Groote in his travels, and was ordained priest. A band of earnest thinkers gathered around the pair, and Florentius's vicarage became their home. After Groote's death in 1384, Florentius became the head of this community. In 1391 the brethren moved into their own house and their number increased, although the plague of 1398 deprived them of many members. They accordingly moved to Amersfoort, only to return after a year. The community controlled by Florentius was, as Thomas à Kempis says in his *Vita*, a mirror of holiness and an ornament of morals, a refuge of the poor, a convent of the clergy, a school of life for the worldly, and a helper of poor scholars. The directions of Florentius became authoritative for all later foundations. After his conversion he was a harmonious picture of modern piety, which, rooted in humility, did not withdraw from the world, but by self-denial sought to win all men for the higher life. At 3 A.M. he began to prepare the work of the brethren and during the day the needy sought his help. No work of charity was too great or too small for him. He bathed the sick himself, and whoever met him once never forgot the deep impression of his personality. He encouraged severe self-examination, and gave prudent advice: "First think, and then act, but do not stop; never work mechanically; never seek thyself." The literary activity of Florentius was scanty, and he restricted himself to matters concerning humility and the fear of God. His principal works are as follows: a letter written at the request of Henricus de Balueren, included by Jan Busch (q.v.) in his *Chronicon Windeshemense*, and appended in complete form to the life of Florentius by Thomas à Kempis; *Tractatulus devotus de exstirpatione vitiorum et passionum et acquisitione verarum virtutum et maxime caritatis Dei et proximi et veræ unionis cum Deo et proximo, seu tractatulus de spiritualibus exercitiis* (ed. H. Nolte, Freiburg, 1862); *Puncta quædam secundum quæ actus suos volebat moderari, quæ quis legens poterit aliqualiter cognoscere interiora ipsius*, appended to the life by Thomas à Kempis, and commonly called *bona puncta*. This latter work reflects the ideal of a man of benevolence and contains the *conclusa et proposita* prepared by Groote, but collected and enlarged by Florentius. It agrees, for the most part, with the *Tractatulus*. and is extant in many manuscripts and recensions of his pupils, but the most original form is given by J. B. Malon, in his *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le véritable auteur du Livre de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ* (3d ed., Paris, 1858). Meditation upon the principles of Florentius inspired the writings of his pupils, Thomas à Kempis, Theodore of Herzen, and Zerbold of Zütphen. A work of this character, reflecting the spirit of Florentius, was discovered by J. M. Wüstenhoff in a Berlin manuscript and reprinted by him under the title *Parvum et simplex exercitium ex consuetudine humilis patris domini Florentii et aliorum devotorum* (*Archief voor nederlandsche Kerkgeschiedenis*. The Hague, 1894, 80 sqq.). L. Schulze.

Bibliography: Chief sources for a life are the *Vita* by Thomas à Kempis in the latter's *Opera*, ed. Sommalius, Antwerp, 1600, Eng. transl. in *The Founders of the New Devotion*, pp. 81–164, London, 1905; R. Dier, *Scriptum, G. Grote et multis aliis fratribus*, in G. Dumbar, *Analecta*, 3 vols., Deventer, 1719–22, and Dumbar's *Het kerkelyke en werentlyke Deventer*, 2 vols., ib. 1732–38. Consult: K. Grube, *Gerhard Groot und seine Stiftungen*, pp. 66 sqq., Cologne, 1883; *KL*, ix. 728–729; *ADB*, vii. 130; and literature under Common Life, Brethren of the.

FLOREZ, HENRIQUE: Spanish priest; b. at Valladolid Feb. 14, 1701 (?); d. at Madrid May 5, 1773. He was an Augustinian friar, and became teacher of theology at the University of Alcala, rector of the royal college at the same place, theological adviser for the supreme council of Castile and finally general assistant of his order for the Spanish provinces. He wrote a number of works, of which the most important is the *España Sagrada, theatro geografico-historico de la iglesia de España;* the first volume appeared at Madrid in 1747, and the work was carried on by Florez to the end of vol. xxix (1775); a continuation, vols. xxx.–xlviii (1775–1862), was made by his fellow Augustinians, Manuel Risco, Antonio Merino, Jose de la Canal, and the town librarian, P S. de Baranda. The work contains a historical and statistical presentation of the Spanish bishoprics, with their respective chapters and monasteries, and a catalogue of their bishops, martyrs, famous men, etc. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, vol. iii., Innsbruck, 1895. A list of his works is given in *KL*, iv. 1578–79.

FLORIAN, SAINT: The patron saint of Upper Austria, said to have suffered martyrdom by drowning in the Enns at Laureacum (Lorch or St. Lorenz, near Enns, 10 m. s.e. of Linz) during the Diocletian persecution. His *Passio*, however (ed. B. Krusch, *MGH, Script. rer. Merov.*, iii., 1896, 65–71), is a recast of the *Passio Irenæi Sirmii* and of no value. The saint is first mentioned in the eighth century, when his relics are said to have been worshiped *ad puoche* (= *Buche*, "the beech-tree," the site of the present abbey of St. Florian, 5 m. w.s.w. of Enns). There was probably a monastic settlement there as early as the eighth century under Otkar, an itinerant bishop. Charlemagne gave the cloister to Passau. In the beginning of the tenth century it is mentioned as a *congregatio clericorum*. Then it was destroyed by the Hungarians, but in the last quarter of the tenth century it was rebuilt, without, however, regaining its former flourishing condition until Bishop Altmann of Passau made it a foundation of regular canons in 1071, under an able leader, Hartmann. Since then its existence has never been shaken, but the relics of Florian are lost. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Krusch's introduction in *MGH*, ut sup.; *KL*, iv. 1576–77.

FLORUS: Deacon of Lyons; b. in the vicinity of Lyons (according to others, in Spain) in the latter part of the eighth century; d. at Lyons about 860. He was probably educated in Lyons, but despite his reputation for learning, never rose above the rank of deacon, or, according to some accounts, of subdeacon, the capacity in which he officiated under the archbishops Agobard (816–840) Amolo (841–852), and Remigius. He was a firm advocate of the independence of the clergy and the autonomy of the Church of Gaul, so that he appears as a modest opponent of Amalarius, especially in his *De divina psalmodia*, although his defense of the ancient liturgy was not completed until Agobard, after his return from exile, wrote his *De correctione Antiphonarii*. In his *De electionibus episcoporum*, he advocated the canonical choice of bishops, and when Moduin, the bishop of Autun, inspected the diocese of Lyons at the command of the emperor Louis the Pious in 834, Florus assailed him both in prose and verse, moved not only by his affection for Agobard, but also by his devotion to the independence of his diocese and Moduin's attachment to Louis. In the dogmatic controversies of his time he was an opponent of Paschasius Radbertus (q.v.), teaching that the only participation in the body and blood of Christ is that of faith, and accordingly calling the bread the mystical body of the Lord. He set forth his views in his *Expositio missæ*, a work written previous to 834 and consisting for the most part of excerpts from Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, and others. He also took part in the controversy on predestination in his *Sermo de prædestinatione*, while the *Adversus cujusdam errores de prædestinatione*, written in the name of the Church of Lyons against Johannes Scotus Erigena, also seems to have been composed by him. Among his other works special mention may be made of his commentary on the Pauline Epistles, his revision of the *Martyrologium* of Bede, and of his hymns, in all of which he shows wide reading and much skill in composition.

Bibliography: The *Carmina*, ed. E. Dümmler, are in *MGH*, *Poetæ Lat. ævi Caroli*, ii (1884), 507–566; part of his productions are in J. Mabillon, *Vetera analecta*, i. 388 sqq., Paris, 1723; Bouquet, *Recueil*, vi. 262–263, vii. 301–304; *MPL*, cxix. Two poems are printed for the first time by F. Patetta in *Atti* of the Academy of Turin, xxvii (1891–1892), 123–129. Consult: *ASB*, June, vi., pp. xiii.–xvi.; J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, pp. 108–109, 447–453, Carlsruhe, 1840; E. Dümmler, in *NA*, iv (1879), 296–301, 516, 581, 630; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 268–272, Leipsic, 1880; Wattenbach, *DQG*, i (1885), 58, 199, 263, i (1893), 60, 211, 280.

FLORUS, GESSIUS: Last Roman procurator of Judea (64–66 A.D.), successor of Albinus. He was a native of Clazomenæ (on the south side of the Bay of Smyrna) and obtained his office through the friendship of his wife, Cleopatra, with the empress, Poppæa. His cruelty, tyranny, and shameless corruption surpassed that of all his predecessors and led to the final revolt of the Jews, which cost them their national independence. Suetonius (*Vespasian*, iv.) says he perished in the revolt, but Josephus (*Life*, vi.) says merely "he was beaten, and many of those with him fell."

Bibliography: Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII., i. 6, XX., xi. 1; *War*, II., xiv. 2, 4, xv. 1, 2, xvi. 1; Tacitus, *Hist.*, v. 10; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. 445–446, 450 sqq., Leipsic, 1888; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 585, 601 sqq., Eng. transl., I., ii. 190–191, 208 sqq.

FLUE (FLUEHE), NIKOLAUS VON (DER), commonly known as **"Brother Klaus":** Swiss hermit; b. at Flüeli (Flühli, 12 m. s. of Lucerne), in the canton of Unterwalden, Mar. 21, 1417; d. in his hermit's cell at the Ranft, in the ravine of the Melchaa, below Flüeli, Mar. 21, 1487. He descended from a distinguished family, and at first devoted himself to the management of his inherited property. He also served his country well, both in the army and in civil life. In 1462 he appeared in Stans as representative of Obwalden (the western part of Unterwalden) in settling a dispute between the monastery of Engelberg and the church of Stans. He married in 1450, and was the father of five sons and five daughters when he resolved in 1467 to renounce his worldly life. He left his home and passed over the Jura Mountains until he came to the region of Liestal; but a vision and the counsel of a peasant induced him to return to Obwalden. At first he settled in the mountains near Melchthal, but later approached more closely to his home and settled in the Ranft, a desolate place in the mountains, about a quarter of an hour from the home of his family. The congregation of Sachseln built him a small cell and beside it a chapel. In 1482 Brother Klaus founded here partly from his own property a chaplaincy and sacristy. But he did not always remain in his isolation; he wandered about in the neighborhood, and undertook pilgrimages to Einsiedeln and Engelberg. He went about barefooted and bareheaded, his only garment a long gown of coarse gray wool. He renounced all comforts of life, sleeping on the floor of his cell and eating hardly any food. Owing to his severe fasts, people thought that he lived without other food than the sacramental elements and his wide-spread fame originated undoubtedly in this belief. Prominent visitors from afar came to his remote cell, among them Johann Geiler of Kaisersberg, the famous Strasburg preacher, in 1472; the Saxon nobleman Hans von Waldheim, councilor of Halle in 1474; and Albrecht von Bonstetten, dean of Einsiedeln in 1478, who, in 1479, recorded his impressions in a book. People came in such crowds that the famous hermit had to ask the authorities of Obwalden for relief. They were attracted by the miraculous halo of the reputed saint, but also by his earnest admonitions and his striking utterances, which exhibit knowledge of life and intelligent observation.

The hermit obtained his greatest fame by his successful arbitration in the dissensions of the confederate states of Switzerland, which threatened to bring on a civil war. In 1477 five cities, Zurich, Bern, Lucerne, Solothurn, and Freiburg formed a league to protect themselves against the tumultuous gatherings of rural communities. But Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, and Zug, the seats of these insurrectionary gatherings, protested against the ad-

mission of Lucerne into the new league because there had existed since 1332 an agreement between them and that canton that it should not enter a new league without their consent. They also protested against the admission of Solothurn and Freiburg to guard against a preponderance of the cities over the rural element. In the time from 1478 to 1481 the dissensions approached their climax. A last meeting was held in Dec., 1481, in Stans, and it was almost dissolved when Heini am Grund, preacher of Stans, rushed in with a message from Brother Klaus which restored peace among the dissenting parties. The noble deed of the hermit was greatly esteemed and honored all over the country. Six years afterward he was buried in Sachseln. In 1600 a chapel was built over his grave beside the church of Sachseln.

The veneration of the hermit increased after his death, and legends began to cluster around the history of his life. Bullinger expresses true admiration for him in his history of the Reformation, and Luther published in 1528 in union with Speratus a vision of *Bruder Clausen in Schwytz*. In 1590 the Roman Catholics of Switzerland asked the pope to canonize the hermit; but the proceedings instituted to this end in 1591 were not successful; they were reinstituted a second and a third time, also without success. In 1669 nothing more than a beatification could be obtained from Clement IX. In 1887 the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Nikolaus was solemnly celebrated. (G. Meyer von Knonau.)

Bibliography: A list of the voluminous literature on Nikolaus up to 1875 is found in E. L. Rochholz, *Schweizerlegende von Bruder Klaus*, pp. 255–309, Aarau, 1875. Consult: J. Ming, *Der selige Bruder Nikolaus von Flüe*, 3 vols., Lucerne, 1861–71; J. I. von Ah, *Des . . Einsiedlers Nikolaus von Flüe Leben und Wirken*, Einsiedeln, 1887; F. X. Wetzel, *Der selige Nikolaus von Flüe*, ib. 1887.

FOAKES-JACKSON, FREDERICK JOHN: Church of England; b. at Ipswich, Suffolk, Aug. 10, 1855. He studied at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1879), and was ordered deacon in 1879 and ordained priest in 1880. In 1882 he was appointed divinity lecturer in Jesus College, Cambridge, and was elected fellow in 1886. Since 1895 he has been dean in the same college, as well as assistant tutor since 1896. He was curate of Ottershaw, Surrey, 1879–81, of St. Giles, Cambridge, 1882–84, and St. Botolph, Cambridge, 1884–90. He has been examining chaplain to the bishop of Peterborough since 1897 and honorary canon of Peterborough since 1901. He was also select preacher at Cambridge in 1885, 1887, and 1902, and Hulsean Lecturer in 1902 and has written: *History of the Christian Church to A.D. 337* (London, 1891); *Christian Difficulties in the Second and Twentieth Centuries* (Hulsean Lectures for 1902; 1903); *A Biblical History of the Hebrews* (Cambridge, 1903); and *Christ in the Church* (London, 1905).

FOLMAR OF TRIEFENSTEIN: Provost of the chapter of Sts. Peter and Paul at Triefenstein (on the Main below Würzburg) from the middle of the twelfth century; d., according to Kattner, 1181. Belonging to the dialectic school in theology, he had his own opinions on the dogma of the Lord's Supper. They proceeded from the prevalent view that after the ascension of the Lord his body is locally circumscribed in heaven. From this Folmar logically concluded that Christ had never since been on earth and furthermore, as regards the Lord's Supper, that he is not *corporaliter* in the sacrament. But far from being another Berengar (see Berengar of Tours), for Folmar the doctrine of transubstantiation is rather the presupposition of his theory. The peculiarity of his view consisted only in his belief that the Christian drinks the blood simply and purely without the flesh, and eats the flesh of Christ simply and purely without the bones and limbs of the body. It is evident that there is taught here on the one side the transformation into the substance of the body and blood and repudiated on the other side the transformation into the historical body of Christ. Folmar was vehemently opposed by his Bavarian brethren, especially by Gerhoh of Reichersberg (q.v.). Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg convoked a conference at Bamberg where he convinced him of his heterodoxy.

Gerhoh attacked also Folmar's Christology, and the latter defended himself by a treatise, *De carne et anima verbi Dei*, which unfortunately is lost. Folmar made a sharp distinction between the two natures of Christ, teaching that Christ in so far as he is man is not the proper and natural son of God. Only in so far is Christ equal to the Father as he is one with him in essence. Folmar's treatise excited the wrath of the Salzburg theologians. It was just before the great papal schism. Gerhoh as a follower of Alexander III. attempted to secure Folmar's condemnation at the papal court, but Alexander wished to hear both parties. That, however, was impossible because Eberhard of Bamberg and, in all probability, Folmar also, recognized Victor IV as pope. But Alexander had no desire to make matters worse by a dogmatic dispute. So he urged Gerhoh to be silent.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Letters by and to Folmar are in *MPL*, cxciv. 1481–90. Consult: Gerhoh's letters, v., vii., xiii., xv., xx., in *MPL*, cxciii. 494–575, and *De gloria et honore*, xiii. 1 sqq., in *MPL*, cxciii. 1117–1125; the *Apologeticus* of Arno of Reichersberg; J. Bach, *Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters*, i. 398, ii. 431, Vienna, 1873–75.

FONSECA: The name of three noted Roman Catholics.

1. Pedro da Fonseca, Portuguese Jesuit; b. at Cortizada, Portugal, 1528; d. at Coimbra (110 m. n.n.e. of Lisbon) Nov. 4, 1599. On Mar. 17, 1548 he entered the Society of Jesus as a novice, and three years later attended the University of Evora, where he soon became professor and won the title of the "Portuguese Aristotle." After obtaining his doctor's degree in 1580, he gained rapid promotion, being appointed successively assistant to the general of the order, provincial visitor, and head of the house of the professed. Philip II. of Portugal appointed him on a committee for the reform of Portugal, and Gregory XIII. entrusted him with affairs of the utmost importance, while Lisbon owes to him, among other things, the establishment of the Irish College and the convent of St. Martha. The chief works of Da Fonseca are his *Institutiones dialecticæ* (Lis-

bon, 1564) and his *Commentarii in libros metaphysicorum Aristotelis Stagiritæ* (4 vols., Rome, 1577–89). He originated the theory of the "mediate knowledge of God," or the knowledge of the potential or what might have occurred either by itself or under certain conditions, but did not—a theory later developed by his fellow Jesuit, Luis Molina (q.v.).

2. Antonio da Fonseca Soares: Portuguese Franciscan, poet and devotional author; b. at Vidigueira, (13 m. n.e. of Beja) June 25, 1631; d. Oct. 29, 1682, as rector of the theological seminary of Torres Vedras (25 m. n.w. of Lisbon).

3. José Maria da Fonseca: Portuguese Franciscan historian; b. at Evora (75 m. s.e. of Lisbon) Dec. 3, 1690, founded the library of the monastery of Ara Cœli, continued L. Wadding's *Annales Minorum* from 1731 to 1740, and died as bishop of Porto in 1752. (O. Zöckler†.)

FONT. See Baptistery.

FONTANUS, JOHANNES: Reformed preacher; b. at Zoller, in the duchy of Jülich, 1545; d. 1615. He studied theology at Heidelberg, especially under Zacharias Ursinus, who Latinized his name Püts, into Fontanus. In his twenty-third year he finished his studies and became teacher and preacher in the seminary of Neuhausen near Worms, but after the death of Elector Frederick III. was expelled by Ludwig VI., who was a Lutheran. Count John the Older of Nassau-Catzenelnbogen received him into his country, with other preachers exiled from the Palatinate, and made him preacher in Keppel in the principality of Siegen. But Fontanus remained here only a short time. When in the beginning of 1578 the estates of the province of Geldern and of the county of Zütphen elected Count John as their viceregent, he took Fontanus along; and under the count's protection the latter organized a Reformed congregation in Arnhem and became its pastor. It grew rapidly under his able direction; and the influence of Fontanus extended over the Church of the whole province, and even beyond its borders. At the first general synod of the whole Reformed Church in the three principalities of Jülich, Cleves, and Berg, held at Duisberg in 1610, with Dr. Abraham Scultetus, court preacher of Elector Frederick V of the Palatinate, he advised on the organization of the congregations. When, in consequence of the Arminian movement, the secular authorities tried to interfere with the inner affairs of the Calvinistic Church, Fontanus stood with great energy for the autonomy of the Church. He was also influential in bringing about a meeting of the strictly Reformed pastors in 1615 at Amsterdam to pass resolutions against the adherents of Arminius, whom the government protected. He established a high school at Haderwyk and was its curator for fourteen years.

(F. W Cuno†.)

Bibliography: J. W Staats Evers, *J. Fontanus, Arnhem's eerste Predikant*, Arnhem, 1882; A. J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, vi. 159 sqq., Haarlem, 1859; G. G. van Prinsterer, *Archives ou Correspondance inédite de la Maison d'Orange Nassau*, 1st ser., vols. vii., viii., 14 vols., Utrecht, 1835–62.

FONTÉVRAULT, ORDER OF (ORDO FONTIS EBRALDI): A Roman Catholic order, founded in the closing years of the eleventh century by Robert d'Arbrissel, who was born at Arbrissel (the modern Arbresec, in the diocese of Rennes) about 1047 and died in 1117 He was educated at Paris, and at the age of thirty-eight was appointed by Sylvester, bishop of Rennes, vicar-general for the administration of the diocese. Resigning from this office, he taught theology at Angers for a time, and finally retired to a hermit's life in the forest of Craon (Department of Mayenne). He gathered a band of followers, whom he formed, about 1094, into a community of canons regular. Robert built a number of cloisters, of which the most important was that at Fontévrault (8 m. s.e. of Saumur), consisting of a "great minster," dedicated to the Virgin and containing accommodations for 300 widows and virgins; an infirmary dedicated to St. Lazarus and receiving 120 sick or lepers; and a home for magdalens. A monastery with 200 monks was built beside the "great minster," but was subordinate to it, while the great church, dedicated by Calixtus II. in person in 1109, was for the entire community. In 1106 the order was confirmed by Paschal II., and in 1113 was withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, whereupon Robert appointed Petronella de Craon-Chemillé first abbess and prepared a rule. The members of the Order, who were called *pauperes Christi*, were subject to restrictions of extreme asceticism, but the distinctive characteristic was the union of nunneries and monasteries under the control of an abbess, together with the most rigid separation of monks and nuns. The Order was under special protection of the Virgin. At the death of Robert, Fontévrault is said to have contained 3,000 nuns, while in the cloister were the tombs of several of the Plantagenet kings of England.

The Order of Fontévrault never spread widely outside of France, although it included fifty-seven priories in four provinces at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The congregations of Savigny, St. Sulpice, Tiron, and Cadouin had been formed as early as the twelfth century, and drifted away from the Order, which was not altogether free from disputes between the abbesses and the heads of the subordinate monasteries. The French Revolution annihilated the Order, and the last abbess, Julie Sofie Charlotte de Pardaillan, died in destitution in Paris in 1799, while the cloister was turned into a prison. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, vi. 83 sqq. Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. 417–419; O. Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum*, pp. 419–422, Frankfort, 1897; Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, vi. 125 gives a list of the older literature on the order. The Life of Robert d'Arbrissel, by Roberts von Beda Plaine, is in the *Mémoires* of the Association bretonne, 1876, and a *Vita* is in *Mittheilungen aus den Benediktins- und Cisterciens-Orden*, vi (1886), 64 sqq.

FONZIO, BARTOLOMEO. See Italy, the Reformation in, § 3.

FOOLS, FEAST OF (*Festum stultorum, fatuorum, follorum; Fête des foux*): A Christian survival of the old Roman Saturnalia. In the early Church participation in all heathen festivals was strongly interdicted, but there is evidence that about the year 200 there were Christians who still longed for the amusements of this season (Tertullian, *De idololatria*, xliv.). By the fourth century it was

widely observed by Christians. It was opposed by Chrysostom and Asterius of Amasia in the East, and by Augustine, Maximus of Turin, and Petrus Chrysologus of Ravenna in the West. Here an effort was made to remove the heathen character of the feast by making Jan. 1, and occasionally the next following days church festivals (see New Year's Festival). Such measures, however, were in vain. The heathen observance persisted, and in the sixth and seventh centuries it was taken up by Christians among the West Goths, the Franks, and the Anglo-Saxons. Despite the opposition of the Church the Saturnalia continued to be generally celebrated by Romans, Franks, and the various Germanic peoples till into the eleventh century. The festival seems then to have been gradually forgotten by the populace.

Though the Church had fought the custom all along, it was the clergy by whom it was revived. It was now made a regular religious festival. Each of the clerical groups had long had its special day: the deacons, St. Stephen's day (Dec. 26); the priests, St. John's day (Dec. 27); the boys, Holy Innocents' day (Dec. 28); the subdeacons, New Year's day or Epiphany, Jan. 6. Later the festivals of the subdeacons and the children became especially popular, and the latter developed the unseemly performances of the "Boy-bishop" (q.v.). Similar extravagances and excesses are found in the festivals of the priests, deacons, and subdeacons as early as the twelfth century. The latter, like the boys, elected a bishop, whom they accompanied to the church in festive procession. Here a parody on the mass was held, which was enlivened by jokes and ribald songs, sometimes by bloody brawls.

The first attempt to suppress these extravagances was made in Paris in 1198 by the papal legate, Peter of Capua. In 1210 Innocent III. forbade the festivals of priests, deacons, and subdeacons, and in 1246 Innocent IV. made such observances punishable with excommunication. Nevertheless they continued, and in the fourteenth century there were even rituals for the ceremonies. Often the fool-bishop was required to give the usual banquet "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." At the end of the fourteenth century the clergy appeared in the churches masquerading as animals, women, and mountebanks. Instead of incense, sausage, or pieces of old shoes were burned; instead of the responses, songs of doubtful character were sung; and instead of the holy wafer, sausage was eaten. There were also dancing and games, such as throwing of dice. The processions, in which nude boys amused the rabble with suggestive gestures and speeches, were even worse.

Through an encyclical addressed to all bishops in France by the University of Paris, May 12, 1444, and made effective by an order of Charles VII., Apr. 17, 1445, these sacrilegious practises were finally stopped, at least in France, where they had been most common. The children's festival, though often opposed and forbidden by the Council of Basel (1431), was less objectionable and survived into the sixteenth century. In Cologne the custom continued till the seventeenth, and in Reims and Mainz till the eighteenth century.

(H. Böhmer.)

Bibliography: C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis*, s.v. "cervala," ii. 277–278, Berlin, 1883; J. B. Lucotte du Tilliot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la fête des foux*, Lausanne, 1741; A. Schmidt, *Thesaurus juris ecclesiastici*, iii. 58–83, Bamberg, 1744; E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, chap. xiii., nos. 3–11, 4 vols., 1788; *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und katholische Theologie*, xi. 2 (1850), 161–180; A. Springer, *Paris im 13. Jahrhundert*, pp. 66 sqq., Leipsic, 1856; M. E. C. Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, London, 1868; A. Tille, *Die Geschichte der deutschen Weihnacht*, ib. 1893, Eng. transl., London, 1899; *KL*, iv. 1398–1403.

FOOT-WASHING: A religious ceremony practised at various times in different branches of the Church. The use of sandals among the Eastern natives required frequent washing of the feet, and to perform this office for others was considered a mark of hospitality. At the Last Supper Jesus washed the feet of his disciples (John xiii. 5–10) to indicate that he who was not purified by him had no part with him. The postapostolic age understood the example thus given to be mandatory. Augustine (*Epist. ad Januarium*) testifies that it was followed on Maundy Thursday by the Church of his day. St. Bernard in his sermon *De cœna Domini* recommends foot-washing as "a daily sacrament for the remission of sins." In the Greek Church also it was regarded as a "mystery." Yet it nowhere became a general, public, solemn, ecclesiastical act. It is still, however, solemnly performed in certain places as by the pope, the emperors of Austria and Russia, the kings of Spain, Portugal, and Bavaria, and a number of bishops and monastic superiors, the subjects being twelve poor old men invited for the purpose, or twelve priests. Many minor Baptist bodies also observe the custom (see Adventists, 2; Baptists, II., 4, *d*, *g*, *h*; Dunkers, II, § 3).

The Reformers, especially Luther (cf. his Maundy Thursday sermon concerning foot-washing in the *Hauspostille*), opposed "that hypocritical foot-washing, in which one stoops to wash the feet of his inferior, but expects still more humility in return." The Evangelical Church has endeavored, therefore, to impress the meaning of Christ's act on the hearts of men by diligently proclaiming his Gospel. At Schwäbisch Hall (in Württemberg), on Wednesday before Easter every year, a special *Fusswaschungspredigt* is still delivered in St. Catherine's Church. The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command; but the practise afterward fell into disuse. The Anabaptists declared most decidedly in favor of foot-washing, appealing to John xiii. 14, and also to I Tim. v. 10, considering it as a sacrament instituted by Christ himself, "whereby our being washed by the blood of Christ and his example of deep humiliation is to be impressed upon us" (Confession of the United Baptists or Mennonites, 1660). The Moravians with the love-feasts revived also the foot-washing, yet without strictly enforcing it or confining it to Maundy Thursday. It was performed not only by the leaders toward their followers, but also by the latter among themselves, during the singing of a hymn explanatory of the symbol. This prac-

tise was finally abolished by the Moravian Synod in 1818. In the Lutheran Church, during the period of orthodoxy, foot-washing was considered as "an abominable papal corruption." In the year 1718 the Upper Consistory at Dresden condemned twelve Lutheran citizens of Weida to public penance for having permitted Duke Maurice William (at that time still a Roman Catholic) to wash their feet. PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, IV., xxii. 8, 4 vols., Bassano, 1788; J. Goar, *Euchologium*, pp. 591–596, Paris, 1647; G. Catalani, *Cæremoniale episcoporum . commentariis illustratum*, ii. 265–272, Rome, 1744; W F. Gess, *Die Fusswaschung Jesu*, Basel, 1884; F. Kattenbusch, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde*, Freiburg, 1890; *KL*, iv. 2145–48.

FORBES, ALEXANDER PENROSE: Bishop of Brechin; b. at Edinburgh June 6, 1817; d. at Dundee (37 m. n.n.e. of Edinburgh) Oct. 8, 1875. He studied at the University of Edinburgh, Haileybury College, and Brasenose College, Oxford (B.A., 1844; M.A., 1846; D.C.L., 1848), where he came strongly under the influence of the Oxford movement. Before entering Oxford he was in the civil service in India. He was curate at Aston Rowant, near Oxford, 1844, and at St. Thomas', Oxford, 1845. In 1846 he became the incumbent of Stonehaven, Kincardineshire, in May, 1847, vicar of St. Saviour's, Leeds, a church built expressly to further the tractarian doctrine. Later in the same year he was appointed bishop of Brechin. He removed the headquarters of the bishopric to Dundee and added to his duties as bishop those of vicar of St. Paul's, Dundee. For inculcating the doctrine of the real presence in his primary charge to the clergy, Aug. 5, 1857, he was formally tried for heresy. He was finally acquitted with an admonition and censure in Mar., 1860. Bishop Forbes published numerous sermons, commentaries, translations, etc.; his principal works are, *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed* (Oxford, 1852; 2d ed., enlarged, 1866), a handbook of dogmatic theology; *An Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles* (2 vols., 1867–68); and *Kalendars of Scottish Saints* (Edinburgh, 1872).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. J. Mackey, *Bishop Forbes, a Memoir*, London, 1888; S. M. F. S[kene]; *Memoir of Alexander Bishop of Brechin*, ib. 1876.

FORBES, JOHN: Scotch theologian; b. May 2, 1593; d. at Corse (19 m. w. of Dumfries), Kirkcudbrightshire, Apr. 29, 1648. He studied at King's College (Aberdeen), and at Heidelberg, Sédan, and other Continental universities, and in 1619 was ordained at Middelburg, returning in the same year to Aberdeen, where his father was bishop. In 1620 he was appointed professor of divinity in King's College, Aberdeen, where he was conspicuous for his defense of episcopacy. He succeeded to his father's estate of Corse in 1635, and two years later was an advocate of the project to unite the Reformed and Lutheran churches. In 1638, however, he refused to sign the National Covenant, and despite the protests of the synod was ejected from his professorship by the General Assembly He accepted the Presbyterian form of government, but the Solemn League and Covenant, sanctioned in 1643, forced him to leave Scotland, and from 1644 until 1646 he resided in Holland. He then returned to his native country, and spent the remainder of his life at Corse. Forbes, who was irenic in temperament, was the author of *Irenicum amatoribus veritatis et pacis in Ecclesia Scoticana* (Aberdeen, 1629) and *Institutiones historico-theologicæ de doctrina Christiana* (Amsterdam, 1645), as well as of a number of minor writings. His complete Latin works, including several posthumous treatises and a Latin translation of his diary, were edited by G. Garden (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1702–03).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A *Life* by Dr. Garden was prefixed to the Works, ut sup.; *DNB*, xix. 402–404.

FORBES, PATRICK: Bishop of Aberdeen; b. probably at Corse (30 m. n.w. of Aberdeen), 1564; d. at Aberdeen Mar. 28, 1635. He studied at the universities of Glasgow and St. Andrews under his kinsman Andrew Melville (q.v.). In deference to his father's wishes, he declined a professorship in theology, and did not take orders till 1612, though for years he had been preaching privately at Corse. Prior to his ordination he had begun to hold services in the parish church, but these public ministrations were stopped by royal order. He held the pastoral charge of Keith 1612–18. In 1616 he took a prominent part in the General Assembly, and was placed upon a commission to revise the confession of faith, liturgy, and rules of discipline. In 1618 he was appointed bishop of Aberdeen. He was conspicuously successful in the administration of his diocese, did much to put down existing feuds, and raised the University of Aberdeen to a condition of prosperity. His principal work is *An Exquisite Commentary upon the Revelation of St. John* (London, 1613; Middelburg, 1614; Lat. transl., Amsterdam, 1646), which is directed against Romanism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Funeral of Patrick Forbes, . consisting of Sermons, Orations, Epitaphs, and other Pieces on the Death of the good Bishop*, Aberdeen, 1635, reprinted by C. F. Shand for the Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, 1845; *DNB*, xix. 407–409.

FORBES, WILLIAM: Bishop of Edinburgh; b. at Aberdeen 1585; d. there Apr. 12, 1634. He studied at Marischal College (M.A., 1601), where he held the chair of logic for several years. He traveled on the Continent 1606–11, visiting several Dutch and German universities and making the acquaintance of Scaliger, Grotius, and Vossius. Soon after his return to Britain he entered the ministry, having declined a professorship in Hebrew at Oxford. In 1616 he was appointed one of the ministers of Aberdeen, and at the assembly at Perth in 1618 he was chosen to defend the article enjoining kneeling at the communion. In 1621 he was chosen one of the ministers of Edinburgh, but, owing to the unwelcome reception which his Romanism encountered here, he was glad to return to his former charge at Aberdeen in 1626. In 1633 he preached at Holyrood before Charles I., who was so delighted with the sermon that he made the preacher bishop of Edinburgh. Forbes was consecrated in Feb., 1634. His only published work is the posthumous *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum de justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum Christo mediatore et eucha-*

ristia (London, 1658; Helmstädt, 1704; Frankfort, 1707; new ed., with Eng. transl., 2 vols., Oxford, 1850–56, forming part of the *Anglo-Catholic Library*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A *Vita auctoris* is prefixed to the *Considerationes*. Consult *DNB*, xix. 411–412.

FOREIRO, FRANCISCO (FRANCISCUS FORERIUS): Portuguese Dominican and theologian; b. at Lisbon about the beginning of the sixteenth century; d. at Almada (2 m. s. of Lisbon) Jan. 10, 1581. He was educated in his native city and at Paris, and shortly after his return about 1540 was appointed censor and court-chaplain. He was a royal delegate to the Council of Trent in 1561, and was appointed, together with Marino, archbishop of Lanciano, and Foscarari, bishop of Modena, to prepare a catechism and to revise the Missal and Breviary; he was also secretary of a committee to continue the *Index librorum prohibitorum*. He returned to Portugal in 1566 and was made prior of his monastery, and shortly afterward provincial, but in 1571 he retired to the monastery at Almada, where he lived in strict seclusion for the remainder of his life. His chief works are *Isaiæ prophetæ vetus et nova ex Hebraico versio, cum commentario in quo omnes loci quibus sana doctrina adversus hæreticos atque Judæos confirmari potest summo studio ac diligentia explicantur* (Venice, 1563); and the unpublished *Commentaria in omnes libros prophetarum ac Job, Davidis et Salomonis* and *Lucubrationes in evangelia quæ per totum anni curriculum leguntur*. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, i. 3, chap. xv., Paris, 1678, Eng. transl., *Critical History of the O. T.*, London, 1682; J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Script. ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 261 sqq., Paris, 1721; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, i. 159–161, Innsbruck, 1892; *KL*, iv. 1600–1601.

FORMATÆ LITERÆ. See COMMENDATORY LETTERS.

FORMOSUS: Pope 891–896. He was born at Rome c. 816, was elevated to the office of cardinal bishop of Porto in 864, and was employed by various popes on important missions. Nicholas I. sent him to the Bulgarians in 866, when Prince Bogoris asked for Roman missionaries (see BULGARIANS, CONVERSION OF THE). Adrian II. sent him to Gaul in 869, to negotiate with the Frankish clergy concerning the divorce of King Lothair, and to Trent in 872 to take part in the conferences between the Empress Engelberga and Louis the German respecting the transfer of Italy to the latter's eldest son. John VIII. also honored Formosus at the outset, in 875 sending him as envoy to Charles the Bald. Soon afterward, however, there set in a complete reaction in this pope's opinion of Formosus. As opponent of John's West Frankish policy, he was summoned by the pope before a Roman synod; and on failing to present himself within the appointed term, he was sentenced, at a second synod, June 30, 876, to deposition and excommunication. This severe sentence was based on allegations that Formosus had aspired to the archiepiscopate in Bulgaria; that he had created a party for himself in Rome with designs upon the apostolic see; and that he had once forsaken his diocese ten weeks, when it was menaced by the Saracens. The fact is that Formosus fell a victim to political opposition. The excommunication was repeated at the Synod of Troyes in 878. Formosus then submitted himself to the pope and gained reinstatement in the Church, but only under sworn promise never again to return to Rome, or to strive to recover his diocese. Till the death of John VIII. Formosus lived in the West Frankish kingdom at Sens. But John's successor, Marinus, absolved him from the compulsory oath, permitted him to return to Rome, and restored to him the diocese of Porto. In this episcopal capacity he bestowed consecration upon Stephen V., in 885. In 891 he himself ascended the papal throne.

As pope Formosus had opportunity to display energy in several directions. He showed great strictness toward the Eastern clergy, and rejected the appeal for the reconciliation of the priests ordained by the Patriarch Photius, being ready to receive them into the fellowship of the Church merely as laymen. In the strife between Archbishop Hermann of Cologne and Archbishop Adalgar of Hamburg-Bremen about the relations of the dioceses of Bremen and Cologne (see ADALGAR; HAMBURG, ARCHBISHOPRIC OF), Formosus, conformably to the synod held at Frankfort in 892, under the presidency of Archbishop Hatto of Mainz, decided that Bremen should remain united with Hamburg; only the archbishop of Hamburg, either in person or by deputy, must be present at the provincial synods in Cologne. In the strife between Count Eudo of Paris and Charles the Simple for the throne of the West Franks, Formosus upheld the latter, and summoned to his support the German king Arnulf. The dissolution of the Frankish kingdom was a matter of great moment for the apostolic see. At the outset, Formosus was compelled to ally himself with Duke Vido of Spoleto, but the latter's aggressive attitude proved so formidable that even by 893 he called Arnulf to help. He invested the latter with the imperial crown in 896. Formosus died Apr. 4, 896.

The name of Formosus, however, owes its renown not so much to his deeds as pope, as to the crimes committed against his dead body, and to the dogmatic confusions therewith connected. Under Stephen VI. (896–897), the Spoletan party again came into ascendancy at Rome, and used its power to make a repulsive exhibition of its hatred for the deceased pope on account of his German sympathies. Stephen VI. convened a synod, the corpse of Formosus was exhumed, and, arrayed in pontifical state, it was enthroned on St. Peter's *cathedra;* thereupon complaint was lodged against the departed pontiff, charging him with uncanonical usurpation of the papal see; the synod pronounced him deposed, and all the consecrations he had performed null and void; they tore from his body the apostolic vestments, cut off the three oath-fingers from his right hand, and buried his body in a remote place; it was afterward sunk in the Tiber. In 897 Pope Theodore II. repealed the decisions of the synod; and in the following year John IX. expressly proclaimed, through two syn-

ods, the validity of the consecrations dispensed by Formosus. Nevertheless the infatuation of the anti-German party was such that Sergius III. (904–911) surpassed the decisions of that scandalous synod, compelling the clergy ordained by Formosus to undergo a second consecration.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ* of Formosus are in Bouquet, *Recueil*, ix. 202–204, and, with the *Privilegia* and notes, in *MPL*, cxxix. 837–854. Sources are: Liudprand, *Antapodosis*, i. 28 in *MGH*, *Script.*, iii (1839), 282–283; *Chronica S. Benedicti*, ib. p. 204; *Annales Fuldenses*, ib. i. (1826) 409 sqq.; *Mariani Scotti chronicon*, ib. (1844) 553; Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis ecclesiæ*, ib. xiii (1881), 559–560; the writings of Auxilius and Vulgarius in defense of Formosus, in E. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius*, Leipsic, 1866. Consult: Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 435–439; E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reichs*, vols. ii.–iii., Leipsic, 1887–88; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche bis Gregor VII.*, pp. 295 sqq., Bonn, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, iii. 126–232, London, 1895; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 93–114; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 297–299.

FORMULA OF CONCORD.

Preliminary History (§ 1).
Mediation of Jakob Andreä (§ 2).
The Formulas of Maulbronn and Torgau (§ 3).
The Formula of Concord (§ 4).

The Formula of Concord is the last of the six confessional books of the Lutheran Church, forming the close of the Book of Concord. The Lutheran Church, from the beginning, has stood for pure doctrine; i.e., the doctrine of the three symbols of the ancient Church, of the Augsburg Confession (or more precisely of Luther,) and of the church and school of Wittenberg. Melanchthon dogmatized and thus externalized the authority of Luther; but he departed from Luther's doctrine. Thus, after Luther's death dissensions arose, and two opposite tendencies were developed. Both parties—the Melanchthonians or Crypto-Calvinists (see PHILIPPISTS) and the Gnesio-Lutherans such as Flacius (q.v.)—fell into extremes and exaggerations. Among the questions in dispute may be mentioned the Interim and the matter of adiaphora (after 1547); Osiander's doctrine of justification (after 1550); the Majoristic controversy (see MAJOR, GEORG) over the assertion of Major and Menius that good works are necessary for salvation and the opinion of Amsdorf that they are an obstacle to salvation (after 1552), and in connection with it the antinomistic controversy; the controversy on the Lord's Supper (after 1552); the synergistic controversy (after 1555); and the Christological controversies, which began in the early sixties. The idea of effecting an agreement between the two contending parties arose at an early time. In 1556 Flacius issued "lenient propositions" in that direction, but made them dependent upon a public confession of those who had erred. Melanchthon acknowledged his fault in regard to the Interim, but excused his attitude. The seriousness of the situation was generally felt at the Religious Colloquy of Worms in 1557 (see WORMS), when the Saxon theologians (i.e., the party of Flacius) questioned the right of their Philippist opponents to appeal to the Augsburg Confession. The Protestant princes tried to establish peace by the Frankfort Recess (q.v.) in 1558, at which the introduction of an official censorship of writings of a religious nature was decreed; but the adherents of Flacius successfully resisted all such attempts. At the Diet of Naumburg (1561), where an open Calvinist like Frederick III. of the Palatinate was the leader, the divergence in doctrine regarding the Lord's Supper became more evident than ever. It was felt that the Augsburg Confession was not a sufficient confessional basis. A convention at Lüneburg, for instance, demanded a *corpus doctrinæ* which should comprise, besides the Augsburg Confession, the Augsburg Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, and Luther's catechism, as well as his other writings. Such *corpora doctrinæ* arose now in different parts of the country. The Melanchthonians also produced a *Corpus doctrinæ christianæ* (Leipsic, 1560), in which they embodied chiefly works of Melanchthon. In this way fixed norms of doctrine were established. The next task was to establish a common *corpus doctrinæ* for the whole Lutheran Church of Germany. It was solved by the "Book of Concord" [the title of the *Formula concordiæ* in the *editio princeps*, 1580; this name was afterward reserved for the collection of all the Lutheran symbols], in which the different *corpora doctrinæ* found their consummation.

1. Preliminary History.

The different collections of confessions, however, did not wipe out the old controversies on the Philippist errors. The need of a new confession as the only satisfactory solution of the difficulty was felt more and more. In June, 1567, Landgrave William IV of Hesse-Cassel and Duke Christopher of Württemberg commissioned Jakob Andreä to draw up a formula which could be accepted by all theologians of the Augsburg Confession. It bore the title, *Bekenntnis und kurze Erklärung etlicher zwiespaltiger Artikel, nach welcher eine christliche Einigkeit in den Kirchen, der Augsb. Konfession zugethan, getroffen und die ärgerliche, langwierige Spaltung hingelegt werden möchte.* It related chiefly to the five articles of justification by faith, good works, free will, adiaphora and the Lord's Supper. But the time was not yet ripe for the success of the plan. Duke Christopher, the originator of the idea, died, and Landgrave William of Hesse-Cassel conceived the impracticable scheme of applying the intended agreement not only to all elements of German Protestantism, but also to the Reformed Churches outside of Germany. In Electoral Saxony Philippism still flourished, and the theologians of Ducal Saxony still clung to their ultra-Lutheran views. Andreä's journeys to Saxony in 1569 and 1570 did not alter the situation. After the death of Duke John William of Saxony the ultra-Lutheran party was dispersed under the protectorate of Elector August, and the eyes of the elector, who had always regarded himself a good Lutheran, were opened to the Crypto-Calvinism existent in his own country. In 1573, before the overthrow of Crypto-Calvinism in Electoral Saxony, Andreä had published *Sechs christliche Predigten* (Tübingen, 1573), in which he tried to settle the controversies not by theological investigations, but by the catechism. The sermons openly showed his Lutheran convictions. He had

2. Mediation of Jakob Andreä.

changed his position; there was no attempt any longer to conceal anything that might be disagreeable to the Philippists. The original thought of reconciling Lutherans and Philippists by a formula of compromise had been abandoned as impossible. The plan now was to draw up a formula that should consolidate all Lutherans against Philippists and Calvinists. Through the mediation of the theological faculty in Tübingen, the sermons of Andreä were not unfavorably received in North Germany by leaders like Martin Chemnitz of Brunswick, Joachim Westphal of Hamburg, David Chytræus and the theological faculty of Rostock. Andreä was asked to put his sermons in the form of articles. Thus originated the so-called Swabian Concordia, which showed great similarity to the later Formula of Concord. It was signed by the theologians in Tübingen and the members of the consistory in Stuttgart, and in Mar., 1574, was sent to Duke Julius of Brunswick and to Chemnitz, that they might enter into negotiations with the churches of Lower Saxony.

After the overthrow of Philippism in Electoral Saxony, the elector himself felt the need of ending the disastrous controversies by a generally accepted formula. In Nov., 1575, at the instance of Count George Ernest of Henneberg, Duke Louis of Württemberg and Margrave Charles of Baden, Lucas Osiander, court preacher of Württemberg, Balthasar Bidembach, provost at Stuttgart, and Abel Scherdinger, court preacher of Henneberg, with several theologians of Baden, composed the Formula of Maulbronn, which was signed in the monastery of Maulbronn Jan. 19, 1576. This formula agreed with the Swabian Concordia in content, but departed from it in that it preserved the order of articles in the Augsburg Confession. Both formulas were sent to Elector August, who asked Andreä for an opinion on them. Andreä gave the preference to the Formula of Maulbronn and at the same time induced the elector to convoke an assembly of theologians for the purpose of establishing a common *corpus doctrinæ*. The time was favorable, as many of the old polemical agitators had died. In Feb., 1576, there was a convention at Lichtenberg, and from May 28 to June 7 at Torgau. The leading theologians were Nicolaus Selnecker, Andreä, Chemnitz, Chytræus, and Andreas Musculus. On the basis of the Swabian and Maulbronn formulas there was established a third one acceptable to all parties, the Book of Torgau, of which Elector August sent copies to most of the Evangelical estates of Germany. As Landgrave William and others criticized the prolixity of the Book of Torgau, Andreä made an epitome (*Kurzer summarischer Auszug der Artikel, so zwischen den Theologen augsburgischer Konfession viele Jahre streitig, zu Torgau durch die daselbst versammelten und unterschriebenen Theologen im Monat Junio 1576 christlich verglichen worden*).

3. The Formulas of Maulbronn and Torgau.

By Feb., 1577, most of the requested criticisms on the Book of Torgau had been sent to Dresden. Elector August then commissioned Andreä, Chemnitz and Selnecker to come to an agreement on the final form of the confession. After having been joined later by Andreas Musculus and Christof Körner of Electoral Brandenburg, and by David Chytræus of Rostock, they began their meetings at Bergen, near Magdeburg; and on May 28, 1577, there was laid before the elector the Book of Bergen (Bergen Formula), which is identical with the *Solida declaratio* of the Formula of Concord. At the same time Andreä's epitome of the Book of Torgau was carefully read, article by article, and approved. The electors of Saxony and Brandenburg now sent copies of the Book of Bergen for approbation and subscription to all estates whose consent to the new plan was undoubted. It is not strange that the confession was not received everywhere with the same willingness. Churches which had gone through a different process of confessional development and had adopted the later doctrines of Melanchthon, in order to retain their connection with the Calvinistic Church, rejected the confession of Bergen and were driven to the Reformed confession. At the instigation of Queen Elizabeth of England, Count Palatine John Casimir, an adherent of the Reformed faith, attempted to obstruct the acceptance of the Formula of Concord by forming a counterunion of all the Reformed Churches at the Convention of Frankfort (1577), but without success.

4. The Formula of Concord.

The " Book of Concord " was published, in German, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Augsburg Confession (June 25, 1580). The first authorized Latin text appeared in 1584, in Leipsic. The confession was signed by three electors, twenty dukes and princes, twenty-four counts, four barons, thirty-eight free cities, and nearly eight thousand preachers and teachers. It was rejected by Hesse, Anhalt, Pfalz-Zweibrücken, Brunswick, Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, Frankfort-on-the-Main, Danzig, Bremen, Speyer, Worms, Nuremberg, Strasburg, Magdeburg, and Nordhausen. Silesia did not take part in the negotiations. Some of the dissenting State Churches accepted the Formula of Concord at a later time. Although it does not and can not speak the last word of the religious knowledge of Lutheranism, it was a historical necessity. The doctrinal differences produced by Melanchthonian ideas necessitated a separation of churches. The more Philippism approached Calvinism and Gnesio-Lutheranism stepped out of the limits of a party, the less possible was a union. Andreä perceived this at the right moment. A concord among the friends of Lutheranism and the establishment of a uniform *corpus doctrinæ* was possible only if the extreme Philippists together with the Calvinists were excluded. The great importance of the Formula of Concord and of the Book of Concord lies in the fact that by them the Lutheran Church maintained its independence over against Calvinism. It must not be imagined that a theological party had here merely obtruded its views upon the Lutheran Church; in the Formula of Concord there have come to their full development the germs of a really existing consensus of belief. Not only the extremes of Philippism, but also those of the Gnesio-Lutherans, such as Flacius, Amsdorf, and

Osiander, were cut off. Thus the Formula of Concord brought peace to the Lutheran Church, and for a long time gave direction to the efforts of the Church in the sphere of dogmatics. *

(R. SEEBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. T. Müller, *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, Gütersloh, 1877 (text and introduction); Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 258–340 (history and discussion, list of literature), iii. 93–180 (text); H. E. Jacobs, *The Book of Concord*, i. 487 sqq., ii. 245 sqq., Philadelphia, 1893. Consult: J. G. Planck, *Geschichte der Entstehung protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, vols. iv.–vi., 8 vols., Leipsic, 1791–1800; H. L. J. Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus, 1555–1581*, 4 vols., Marburg, 1852–58; K. F. Göschel, *Die Concordienformel nach ihrer Geschichte*, Leipsic, 1858; F. H. R. Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienformel*, 4 vols., Erlangen, 1858–1865; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, pp. 330–374, Leipsic, 1862; C. P. Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology*, pp. 288–328, Philadelphia, 1872; G. Wolf, *Zur Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus, 1555–59*, Berlin, 1888; and in general the works on the church history of the period.

FORNEY, CHRISTIAN HENRY: Church of God; b. at West Hanover, Pa., Oct. 17, 1839. He studied at Oberlin College, but left before taking a degree, and was ordained to the ministry in 1860. After being professor in Mount Joy Academy, Pa., and also pastor of the church of his denomination in the same village 1860–63, he held pastorates at Chambersburg, Pa. (1863–66), Fourth Street Church, Harrisburg, Pa. (1866–68), and Lancaster City, Pa. (1868–70). He was assistant editor of *The Church Advocate*, the organ of his denomination, 1866–69, and has been editor-in-chief since 1869. He was first chaplain of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 1868–69, and since 1866 has been president of the General Eldership of the Church of God, besides being a member of many boards and committees of the same denomination. He describes himself as "orthodox, evangelical, postmillenarian, antidenominational, three monumental ordinances—baptism, washing the saints' feet, and communion—Arminian in theology." Besides revising and editing J. Winnebrenner's *Brief View of the Church of God* (Harrisburg, Pa., 1885) and *Sermon on Baptism* (1885), and M. P. Jewett's *The Mode and Subjects of Baptism* (1905), he has written *The Christian Ordinances* (1883) and *Philosophic Basis of Ordinances and Bible Doctrine of Sanctification* (1905).

FORREST, DAVID WILLIAM: United Free Church of Scotland; b. at Glasgow May 16, 1856. He studied at the University of Glasgow (M.A., 1878), the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh (1877–80), and the University of Leipsic (1880). He has been minister of Saffronhall Church, Hamilton (1882–87), United Presbyterian Church, Moffat (1887–94), Wellington Church, Glasgow (1894–1899), United Free Church, Skelmorlie, Wemyss Bay (1899–1903), and North Morningside United Free Church, Edinburgh (since 1903). He was Kerr Lecturer at Edinburgh in 1897 and a lecturer at Yale in 1901. He has written *The Christ of History and of Experience* (Kerr Lectures; Edinburgh, 1897) and *The Authority of Christ* (1906).

FORSANDER, NILS: Lutheran; b. at Gladsax, Sweden, Sept. 11, 1846. He emigrated to the United States in 1870 and completed his education at Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. (B.A., 1872). He was ordained to the ministry in 1873 and was pastor at Sagetown, Ill., 1873–75, Kingston, Ia., 1875–80, and Bettresda, Ia., 1880–89. Since 1889 he has been professor of theology at Augustana College and Theological Seminary. He was secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod 1886–90, and in theology is a strict evangelical member of his denomination. He has been editor of the *Augustana Theological Quarterly* since 1900, and has written *Augsburgiska bekännelsen med förklaringar* (Rock Island, Ill., 1899) and *Vår lutherska kyrkas ställning till andre kyrkosamfund* (1906).

FORSTER, CHARLES: English clergyman and author; b. 1790; d. at Stisted (35 m. n.e. of London), Essex, Aug. 20, 1871. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin, and was perpetual curate of Ash, Kent, 1834–38, rector of Stisted, near Braintree, Essex, 1838–71, and also one of the six preachers in Canterbury Cathedral 1835–71. He opposed Biblical criticism and aimed in a number of works, now sought as curiosities, to justify the strictest literal interpretation of Scripture. Among other things he published, *Critical Essays on Genesis chap. xx. and on St. Matthew chap. ii. 17, 18*, (Dublin, 1826); *Mahometanism Unveiled* (2 vols., London, 1829); *The Life of John Jebb* (2 vols., 1836); *The Historical Geography of Arabia* (1844); *The One Primeval Language* (3 parts, 1851–54), and *Sinai Photographed, or Contemporary Records of Israel in the Wilderness* (1862).

FORSTER (FOERSTER, VORSTER, FORSTHEMIUS), JOHANN: 1. Lutheran theologian and Hebrew scholar; b. at Augsburg July 10, 1496 (or 1495); d. at Wittenberg Dec. 8, 1558. In 1515 he entered the University of Ingolstadt where he became the most studious and capable Hebrew scholar of Reuchlin; on account of a pestilence he removed in 1521 to Leipsic, and became a pupil of P. Mosellanus, through whose influence, probably, he received in 1522 a position as teacher of Hebrew at the Greek-Latin school in Zwickau. In 1529 he resigned, and in 1530 became a student at the University of Wittenberg, where he remained as preacher about six years. He assisted Luther in the translation of the Bible, and became one of his most devoted pupils and friends. In 1535 he received a call to Augsburg, where he became involved in controversies with his Zwinglian colleagues. In 1539 he became professor of Hebrew at Tübingen, on the recommendation of Luther and Camerarius. The question whether the Reformation should proceed according to

* The Formula of Concord consists of two parts, the *Epitome* and the *Solida repetitio et declaratio*, each divided into twelve articles, as follows: i., of original sin; ii., of free will; iii., of justification by faith; iv., of good works; v., of the Law and the Gospel; vi., of the third use of the Law; vii., of the Lord's Supper; viii., of the person of Christ; ix., of Christ's descent into hell; x., of church usages and ceremonies called adiaphora; xi., of God's foreknowledge and election; xii., of several heresies and sects. The second part repeats at greater length what is concisely stated in the Epitome with confirmatory quotations.

Saxon or Swiss principles and doctrines was then a burning one, and Forster lost his position in this struggle because he did not side with the Zwinglians. In 1542 he became provost of St. Lawrence at Nuremberg, and thence extended his reformatory activity, first to Regensburg in 1542 and in the following year to the county of Henneberg. In unselfish devotion to the cause of the Reformation he sacrificed his position at Nuremberg, but as his plans of church discipline were not carried out, he went into voluntary retirement after three years. After some vain efforts of Melanchthon and his friends to find a position for him, Prince George of Anhalt called him as superintendent to the bishopric of Merseburg, and subsequently Duke Augustus provided him with a capitular prebend. After Cruciger's death in 1549, he was called to Wittenberg as professor of Hebrew and preacher at the Castle Church. In 1544 he took part in the convention of Naumburg on the side of Melanchthon. The last decade of his life may be designated as the Melanchthonian period, since be became more lenient in church discipline and expressed himself in a more conciliatory manner on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The principal work of his life is a great Hebrew-Latin dictionary, *Dictionarium hebraicum novum, non ex rabbinorum commentis nec ex nostratium doctorum stulta imitatione descriptum sed ex ipsis thesauris S. Bibliorum et eorundem accurata collatione depromptum* (Basel, 1557; 2d ed., 1564).

2. Not to be confounded with the above is the younger **Johann Forster;** b. at Auerbach (15 m. s.w. of Zwickau), Saxony, Dec. 25, 1576; d. at Mansfeld (38 m. s. of Magdeburg) Nov. 17, 1613. He was preacher at Leipsic, 1593, rector in Schneeberg, 1601; chief preacher of Zeitz, professor of theology in Wittenberg 1609 and finally general superintendent at Mansfeld He was the author of various theological and devotional writings.

(W. GERMANN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W Germann, *Johann Forster, der Henneberger Reformator*, Meiningen, 1894; Förster, in *ZHT*, 1869, pp. 210 sqq.; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland*, pp. 97 sqq., 136, Breslau, 1870; *KL*, iv. 1625–26.

FORSYTH, NATHANIEL: Missionary to India. See INDIA, II., § 2.

FORSYTH, PETER TAYLOR: English Congregationalist; b. at Aberdeen, Scotland, May 12, 1848. He studied at the University of Aberdeen (M.A., 1869), the University of Göttingen, and New College, London, and after being assistant to the professor of Latin at the University of Aberdeen was pastor at Shipley, Yorkshire (1876–79), St. Thomas' Square, Hackney (1880–85), Cheetham Hill, Manchester (1885–89), Clarendon Park, Leicester (1889–94), and Emmanuel Congregational Church, Cambridge (1894–1901). Since 1901 he has been principal of Hackney Theological College, Hampstead, London, as well as a member of the theological faculty of London University. In 1905 he was elected chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. In theology he is Evangelical, positive, modern, and social. He has written *Pulpit Parables* (sermons for children, in collaboration with J. A. Hamilton; Manchester, 1886); *Religion in Recent Art* (1889); *The Charter of the Church* (London, 1896); *The Holy Father and the Living Christ* (1897); *Christian Perfection* (1899); *Rome, Reform, and Reaction* (1899); and *The Taste of Death and the Life of Grace* (1901).

FORTUNATUS, VENANTIUS HONORIUS CLEMENTIANUS: Bishop of Poitiers and Christian poet; b. near Treviso, in Upper Italy, c. 535; d. in Poitiers in the beginning of the seventh century. He studied grammar, rhetoric, and jurisprudence in Ravenna, left Italy about 564, went through Germany to Gaul, lived for some time at the court of Sigbert of Austrasia, then went to Tours, and later to Poitiers. Here he became acquainted with Radegunde, a Thuringian princess, the divorced wife of Lothair I., who with her adopted daughter, Agnes, lived in the convent of the Holy Cross. The intercourse with these two women induced the poet to desist from his migratory life and to become presbyter in Poitiers. Thenceforth he lived in close connection with all prominent personalities of the country, wrote poetical eulogies, and grew in authority and fame as a poet, especially after he had collected and published his poems, at the instigation of Gregory of Tours. Shortly before his death he became bishop in Poitiers.

The poetical productions of Fortunatus are very numerous, most of them written for special occasions. He may indeed be called a court poet. Hospitality which he had enjoyed, the celebration of a wedding, a funeral—everything was put into easy verse. His poetic gifts were by no means slight; his language is picturesque and full of thought; his hexameters and pentameters surprise by the purity of their rhythm. But there is also not lacking a certain bombast and artificiality of expression, characteristic of the time, and still more faulty is the base flattery in his eulogies which reflects unfavorably upon his character. Since Fortunatus eulogized quite a number of eminent personages, his poems are valuable also for the historian. His descriptions of nature are excellent, as, for instance, his representation of a journey on the Moselle from Metz to Andernach, which he had undertaken in the suite of the king of Austrasia, likewise a poem on the castle of Bishop Nicetius of Treves. Still more valuable are three elegies composed under the inspiration of Radegunde; one represents the tragic fate of Galsvintha, daughter of a West Gothic king; a second is intended to console Amalafried, cousin of Radegunde, the last Thuringian heir; the last is to console Artachis, a relative of Amalafried, on the death of the latter. The greatest fame of Fortunatus, however, rests upon his religious hymns, as *Vexilla regis prodeunt* (transl. by J. M. Neale, *The royal banners forward go*), and *Pange lingua gloriosi proelium certaminis* (transl. by Neale, *Sing, my tongue, the glorious battle*), hymns on the Passion; and *Quem terra pontus æthera* (transl. by Neale, *The God whom earth and sea and sky*), a hymn on Mary. Fortunatus also wrote a comprehensive epic poem on the life of St. Martin (*De vita Martini*), and some lives of saints in prose, Albinus, Marcellus, Germanus, and

others. He was the last great poet of the period before Charlemagne. (K. LEIMBACH†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Opera*, ed. M. A. Luchi, Rome, 1786–1787, and, ed. F Leo and K. Krusch, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, iv. 1, 2, 1881-85. Consult: F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, pp. 145–161, Carlsruhe, 1840; F. Hamelin, *De vita et operibus Venontii . . Fortunati*, Rennes, 1873; D. Leroux, *Le Poète S. V. Fortunat*, Poitiers, 1885; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 87–89, ii. 489, i (1893), 91, 92, 113; S. W. Duffield, *Latin Hymn-Writers*, pp. 88–96 et passim, New York, 1889; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, pp. 518–542, Leipsic, 1889; C. Nisard, *Le Poète Fortunat*, Paris, 1890; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, pp. 1278–83, Leipsic, 1890; M. Prou, *La Gaule mérovingienne*, pp. 225–235, Paris, 1897; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 306, 315–316, 384, 402–414; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 422; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 383–384; *DCB*, ii. 552–553.

FOSCARARI, EGIDIO: Italian Dominican, bishop of Modena; b. at Bologna Jan. 27, 1512; d. at Rome Dec. 23, 1564. After officiating as lector in various monasteries, he became magister sacri palatii at Rome in 1546. Four years later Julius II. appointed him bishop of Modena, and in this capacity he attended the sessions of the Council of Trent in 1551. When the council was suspended, he returned to his diocese, where he performed his duties in an exemplary manner, but was suspected of heresy by the Inquisition in 1558 and was imprisoned by Paul IV., like his predecessor Giovanni de Morone (q.v.). Although his heterodoxy could not be proved, he did not receive formal absolution until it was granted him by Pius IV. in 1560, whereupon he was permitted to return to his see amid the rejoicings of the people. He was present at the concluding sessions of the council, and was a member of the committees which, after the close of the council, prepared the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, and the *Catechismus Romanus*, and revised the breviary and missal.

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Script. ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 184–185, Paris, 1721; *KL*, iv. 1636–37.

FOSS, CYRUS DAVID: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Kingston, N. Y., Jan. 17, 1834. He studied at Wesleyan University (B.A., 1854), and after being instructor and principal at Amenia Seminary, Amenia, N. Y., 1854–57, entered the ministry in the New York conference, being stationed at Chester, N. Y., in 1857–59. He was then transferred to the New York East conference, and was pastor of churches in Brooklyn (1859–65) and New York (1869–75). From 1875 to 1880 he was president of Wesleyan University, and in 1880 was elected bishop. He was fraternal delegate to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1878, and to the British Wesleyan Conference in 1886, while he made an official tour of the Methodist Episcopal missions in Europe in 1886, of Mexico in 1893, and of India and Malaysia in 1897–98.

FOSSARIAN (Lat. *fossarius, fossor;* Gk. *kopiōn, kopiatēs*): The designation of the grave-diggers of the early Church. In primitive times the burial of the poor was one of the services of love which the wealthier Christians voluntarily undertook for their needy brethren. Later the congregations had special cemeteries, and burial was entrusted to professional grave-diggers, which must have been the case in the third century and possibly even in the latter part of the second. The oldest document showing the existence of fossarians is the *Gesta apud Zenophilum*, which dates from 303 and is printed as an appendix to the editions of Optatus. In this work, as elsewhere, fossarians were reckoned among the clergy, but this was not invariably the case, as, for instance, in Rome. Fossarians are frequently represented in the paintings of the Roman catacombs, and it is clear from the inscriptions that they controlled the sale of graves. See CEMETERIES, II., 4, § 1. H. ACHELIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. B. de Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, iii. 533 sqq., Rome, 1877, Eng. ed. by Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea*, i., chap. vii., pp. 205–216, London, 1879; J. A. Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités; chrétiennes*, p. 281, Paris, 1877; *DCA*, i. 684; *KL*, 1638–40 (valuable).

FOSTER, FRANK HUGH: Congregationalist; b. at Springfield, Mass., June 18, 1851. He studied at Harvard (B.A., 1873), Andover Theological Seminary (graduated in 1877), and the University of Leipsic (Ph.D., 1882). He was assistant professor of mathematics in the United States Naval Academy 1873–74, and pastor of the Congregational church in North Reading, Mass., 1877–79. After his return from Germany he was professor of philosophy in Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., 1882–84, professor of church history in Oberlin Theological Seminary 1884–92, and professor of systematic theology in Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal., 1892–1902, as well as pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Oakland, Cal., 1896–97, and acting professor of systematic theology in the San Francisco Theological Seminary (Presbyterian) 1901–02; pastor of the college and village church at Olivet, Mich., 1904–07; and since 1907 professor of history in Olivet College. He was moderator of the General Association of Congregational Churches in Northern California in 1895, and Stone Lecturer at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1900. In theology his article on the New Testament miracles (*AJT*, 1908) shows him to have passed from the Evangelical to the purely non-supernatural or rationalistic standpoint. He was for several years editor of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and has written *Seminary Method of Study in the Historical Sciences* (New York, 1888); *Fundamental Ideas of the Roman Catholic Church* (Philadelphia, 1899); *Christian Life and Theology: The Contribution of Christian Experience to the System of Evangelical Doctrine* (New York, 1900); *The Teaching of Jesus concerning his own Mission* (1903); and *A Genetic History of the New England Theology* (Chicago, 1907); and has translated Hugo Grotius' *Defence of the Satisfaction of Christ* (Andover, 1889).

FOSTER, GEORGE BURMAN: Baptist; b. at Alderson, W Va., Apr. 2, 1858. He was graduated at the University of West Virginia in 1883, Rochester Theological Seminary in 1887, and studied in Göttingen and Berlin 1891–92. After being pastor of the First Baptist Church, Saratoga Springs, N. Y., 1887–91, he was appointed profes-

sor of philosophy at McMaster University, Toronto, and, in 1895, professor of systematic theology in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. In 1905 he was transferred to the professorship of the philosophy of religion. He is the author of *The Finality of the Christian Religion* (Chicago, 1906).

FOSTER, JAMES: English dissenting minister; b. at Exeter Sept. 16, 1697; d. in London Nov. 5, 1753. He was educated at the free school, and at an academy, in Exeter, where he began preaching in 1718. After holding several obscure and precarious charges he came to London in 1724 as the colleague of Joseph Burroughs at the chapel in the Barbican. In 1728 he became Sunday evening lecturer at the Old Jewry and in 1744 pastor of the independent church at Pinners' Hall He took part in a number of theological controversies and enjoyed a great reputation as a pulpit orator. He is mentioned by Pope in the epilogue to the *Satires*, and it was a proverbial saying that "those who had not heard Farinelli sing and Foster preach were not qualified to appear in genteel company." Though Foster defended the historical evidences of Christianity against the views of Tindal, he was himself essentially a deist and rationalist. Besides numerous sermons, included in a collected edition, *Sermons* (4 vols., London, 1755), he published, *An Essay on Fundamentals* (London, 1720), in which he maintained that the doctrine of the Trinity is not essential; *The Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Revelation* (1731), a reply to Tindal; and *Discourses on All the Principal Branches of Natural Religion and Sociol Virtue* (2 vols., 1749–52), which had 2,000 subscribers.

Bibliography: W. Wilson, *Dissenting Churches*, ii. 270–285, 4 vols., London, 1808–14; J. Ivimey, *Hist. of the English Baptists*, iii. 215, 399–404, ib. 1823; J. Sparks, *Collection of Essays*, v. 171–185, 6 vols., Boston, 1823–26; *DNB*, xx. 54–55.

FOSTER, JOHN: English Baptist; b. at Wadsworth Lane, parish of Halifax (14 m. w.s.w. of Leeds), Yorkshire, Sept. 17, 1770; d. at Stapleton (a suburb of Bristol), Gloucestershire, Oct. 15, 1843. He was the eldest son of a farmer and manufacturer. Up to his eighteenth year he was occupied chiefly with factory work, but had enjoyed some educational advantages and had read largely in Puritan theology. Serious and meditative, he cared little for society or sport and was entranced with the beauties of nature. When seventeen years of age he experienced conversion and was baptized into the fellowship of the Calvinistic Baptist church at Hobden Bridge. Under the influence of Dr. Fawcett, his pastor, he entered the school of the latter (Brearly Hall) to study for the ministry. Here he not only pursued with enthusiasm and success the classical and literary courses offered, but read extensively in theology and became master of an elegant literary style. After three years of preparatory study he proceeded to the Baptist college at Bristol, where in scholarship, depth of thought, and literary skill he surpassed all his fellow students, but proved remarkably lacking in preaching power. With a most intense desire to use his gifts and attainments for the edification of saints and the conversion of sinners, his abstract and overelaborate way of sermonizing, his deficiency in popular touch, and a chronic throat trouble that made his voice ineffective, resulted at Newcastle, Dublin, Chichester, Battersea, and Downend, where he successively ministered, in the dwindling of the congregations and the closing of the chapels. While ultra-Calvinistic in his predestinarianism, he early became almost Arian in his Christology. The latter made him unacceptable to the Particular Baptists, and the former to the General Baptists. For a time he gave instruction to certain African youths who had been brought to England to be educated for missionaries.

While still engaged in pastoral effort Foster published (1805) a volume of *Essays*, including his famous essay *On Decision of Character*, which attracted much attention. From 1808 he was a regular contributor to the *Eclectic Review*. His articles published in this periodical are said to have numbered 185. His essay on the *Evils of Popular Ignorance* (1819), originally an address before a benevolent society, added greatly to his fame. He had an invincible aversion to the Established Church and to the special privileges of the British aristocracy; and the evils of the time in Britain and her colonies he was never weary of attributing to the unchristian and antisocial elements in Church and State. In arraigning the religious and social evils of the time he assumed a somewhat pessimistic tone, but exerted a wide-spread influence in favor of reform. Among his other writings are *An Introduction to Doddridge's 'Rise and Progress'* (Glasgow, 1825), and *Lectures Delivered at Broadmead Chapel* (1844–47). Among the points on which he differed from his Baptist brethren was his denial of eternal punishment, which he was unable to reconcile with his conceptions of the benevolence and the righteousness of God.

Albert H. Newman.

Bibliography: J. E. Ryland, *Life and Correspondence of John Foster*, 2 vols., London, 1846; *DNB*, xx. 57–59.

FOSTER, ROBERT VERRELL: Presbyterian (formerly Cumberland Presbyterian); b. near Lebanon, Tenn., Aug. 12, 1845. He was graduated at Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1870 and Union Theological Seminary in 1877. He was professor of mathematics in Cooper Institute (near Meridian, Miss.) 1871–75, and in Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa., 1877, professor of English, ethics, psychology, and logic in Cumberland University 1877–81 and also of Hebrew and New Testament Greek 1877–93. Since 1893 he has been professor of systematic theology in the Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary in the same institution. In theology he is a Calvinist, although he believes that in the vicarious atonement of Christ propitiation is made for the sins of the whole world, and that for this reason the Gospel is freely and sincerely offered to all men for their acceptance or rejection. He prepared commentaries on the International Sunday-school Lessons from 1881 to 1895, edited *The Theological Quarterly Review* 1891–92, and has written *Introduction to the Study of Theology* (Chicago, 1889); *Old Testament Studies: Being an Outline of Old*

Testament Theology (1890); *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Nashville, Tenn., 1891); *Brief History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church* (New York, 1894); *Our Doctrines* (Nashville, Tenn., 1897); and *Systematic Theology* (1898).

FOWLER, CHARLES HENRY: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Burford, Ontario, Canada, Aug. 11, 1837; d. in New York Mar. 20, 1908. He was graduated at Genesee College (now Syracuse University) in 1859, and at Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., in 1861. He studied law, but never practised. He held various pastorates (in Chicago 1861–72), and from 1872 to 1876 was president of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. He was editor of the *New York Christian Advocate* 1876–80 and corresponding secretary of the missionary society of his denomination 1880–84. In 1884 ne was elected bishop and for eight years resided on the Pacific Coast, later living in Minneapolis, Minn., Buffalo, N. Y., and New York City. He was a delegate to the General Convention in 1872, 1876, 1880, and 1884, and a fraternal delegate to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1874, as well as the Wesleyan Conference at London in 1898. He made extensive official tours, visiting South America in 1885, and Japan, China, and Korea in 1888, also a tour of the world, visiting the Methodist Episcopal missions in Malaysia and India. He was extremely active in the cause of education, being the founder of the Maclay College of Theology in southern California, the Wesleyan University of Nebraska at Lincoln, Neb., Peking University at Peking, China, and Nanking University in central China. He also founded missions of his denomination in South America and established the first Methodist Episcopal church in St. Petersburg, Russia. He wrote *The Fallacies of Colenso Reviewed* (Cincinnati, O., 1861); *Wines of the Bible* (New York, 1878); and *Missions and World Movements* (1903).

FOWLER, EDWARD: An English clergyman connected with the liberal school in the Church of England and with the "Cambridge Platonists" (q.v.); b. at Westerleigh (8 m. e.n.e. of Bristol), Gloucestershire, 1632; d. at Chelsea Aug. 26, 1714. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Oxford (B.A., 1653), and then migrated to Trinity, Cambridge (M.A., 1655). He was for a while Presbyterian chaplain to the Dowager Countess of Kent, and rector of Norhill, Bedfordshire, from 1656. On the passing of the Act of Uniformity, he hesitated for a while, but finally conformed, and, besides two London livings, received a prebend at Gloucester in 1676, and became bishop of that see in 1691. He is related with the Cambridge school by his correspondence with More, especially on ghost-stories, from 1678 to 1681, and by his defense of their doctrines, published anonymously as a "Free Discourse" on the *Principles and Practice of certain Moderate Divines called Latitudinarians* (London, 1670). Its better-known sequel, *The Design of Christianity* (1671), vigorously attacked by Bunyan, and the *Libertas Evangelica* (1680), may also be mentioned. Influenced as he was by the Platonic school, he yet does not strictly belong to their ranks. His type of latitude was that characteristic of the Revolution period, when the movement had largely ceased to occupy itself with higher philosophy and had become practical, political, and ambitious.

Bibliography: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii. 780, 790, 888, London, 1692; E. Calamy, *Historical Account of my Own Life*, pp. 90, 95, 330, 494, ib. 1713; *Biographia Britannica*, iii. 2012, ib. 1784; J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology . . . in 17th Century*, ii. 35, 437 sqq., Edinburgh, 1882; *DNB*, xx. 84–86 (contains list of his works and full reference to sources).

FOWLER, JOSEPH THOMAS: Church of England; b. at Winterton (12 m. s.w. of Hull), Lincolnshire, June 9, 1833. He was educated at St. Thomas' Hospital Medical School, London (M.R.C.S., L.S.A., 1856), and Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham (B.A., 1861), and was house surgeon at St. Thomas' Hospital 1856–57 and at the Bradford Infirmary 1857–58. After the completion of his theological studies he was curate of Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, 1861–63, chaplain and precentor at St. John's College, Hurstpierpoint, 1864–1869, and curate of North Kelsey, Lincolnshire, 1870. Since 1870 he has been vice-principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham, and university lecturer in Hebrew since 1871, as well as university librarian from 1873 to 1901. He was public examiner in theology 1874–75, senior proctor 1876–77 and 1899–1901, and junior proctor 1882–87. He was keeper of Bishop Cosin's library in 1889 and has been honorary canon of Durham since 1897. He has been for many years local secretary for Durham of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of London, and vice-president of the Surtees Society since 1873. In theology he is an orthodox Churchman, inclining neither to Protestantism nor Roman Catholicism. He has edited for the Surtees Society *Acts of the Chapter of Ripon* (Newcastle, 1875); *The Newminster Cartulary* (1878); *Memorials of Ripon* (3 vols., 1882–88); *Metrical Life of St. Cuthbert* (1891); *Durham Account Rolls* (3 vols., 1898–1901); and *Rites of Durham* (1903); for the Yorkshire Archæological Society *Cistercian Statutes* (London, 1890); for the Yorkshire Record Society *Coucher Book of Selby* (2 vols., Worksop, 1891–93); and also *Adamnani Vita Sancti Columbæ* (Oxford, 1894). He has written *Life and Letters of John Bacchus Dykes* (London, 1897); *Durham Cathedral* (1898), and *Durham University* (1904).

FOX, GEORGE: Founder of the Society of Friends; b. at Drayton-in-the-Clay (Fenny Drayton, 15 m. s.w. of Leicester), Leicestershire, July, 1624; d. in London Jan. 13, 1691. His father, Christopher Fox, was a weaver, called "righteous Christer" by his neighbors; his mother, Mary Lago, was, he tells us, "of the stock of the martyrs." From childhood, Fox was of a serious, religious disposition. "When I came to eleven years of age," he says (*Journal*, p. 2), "I knew pureness and righteousness; for, while I was a child, I was taught how to walk to be kept pure. The Lord taught me to be faithful in all things, and to act faithfully two ways; viz., inwardly to God, and

Early Life.

outwardly to man." As he grew up, his relations "thought to have made him a priest"; but he was put as an apprentice to a man who was a shoemaker and grazier. In his nineteenth year the conduct of two companions, who were professors of religion, grieved him because they joined in drinking healths, and he heard an inward voice from the Lord, "Thou seest how young people go together into vanity, and old people into the earth; and thou must forsake all, both young and old, and keep out of all, and be as a stranger unto all." Then began a life of solitary wandering in mental temptations and troubles, in which he "went to many a priest to look for comfort, but found no comfort from them." At one time, as he was walking in a field, "the Lord opened unto" him "that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ," but that a spiritual qualification was necessary. Not seeing this requisite in the priest of his parish, he "would get into the orchards and fields" by himself with his Bible. Regarding the priests less, he looked more after the dissenters, among whom he found "some tenderness," but no one that could speak to his need. "And when all my hopes in them," he says, "and in all men, were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, oh! then, I heard a voice which said, 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.'"

In 1648 he began to exercise his ministry publicly in market-places, in the fields, in appointed meetings of various kinds, sometimes in the "steeple-houses," after the priests had got through. His preaching was powerful; and many joined him in professing the same faith in the spirituality of true religion. In a few years the Society of Friends had formed itself spontaneously under the preaching of Fox and his companions (see FRIENDS, SOCIETY OF, I., § 1). Fox afterward showed great powers as a religious legislator, in the admirable organization which he gave to the new society. He seems, however, to have had no desire to found a sect, but only to proclaim the pure and genuine principles of Christianity in their original simplicity. He was often arrested and imprisoned for violating the laws forbidding unauthorized worship, for refusal to take an oath, and for wearing his hat in court. He was imprisoned at Derby in 1650, Carlisle in 1653, London in 1654, Launceston in 1656, Lancaster in 1660 and 1663, Scarborough in 1666, and Worcester in 1674, in noisome dungeons, and with much attendant cruelty. In prison his pen was active, and hardly less potent than his voice.

His Ministry. The Society of Friends.

In 1669 Fox married Margaret Fell of Swarthmoor Hall, a lady of high social position, and one of his early converts. In 1671 he went to Barbados and the English settlements in America, where he remained two years. In 1677 and 1684 he visited the Friends in Holland, and organized their meetings for discipline.

Fox is described by Thomas Ellwood, the friend of Milton, as "graceful in countenance, manly in personage, grave in gesture, courteous in conversation." Penn says he was "civil beyond all forms of breeding." We are told that he was "plain and powerful in preaching, fervent in prayer," "a discerner of other men's spirits, and very much master of his own," skilful to "speak a word in due season to the conditions and capacities of most, especially to them that were weary, and wanted soul's rest;" "valiant in asserting the truth, bold in defending it, patient in suffering for it, immovable as a rock." ISAAC SHARPLESS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The original MS. of Fox's *Journal* is in Devonshire House, Bishopsgate W., London; it was published 2 vols., London, 1694–98, and contains the *Epistles, Letters and Testimonials*, bicentenary edition, 1891; selections from it, edited by R. M. Jones with title *George Fox, an Autobiography*, were published, Philadelphia, 1903. Lives have been written by S. M. Janney, Philadelphia, 1852; J. S. Watson, London, 1860; T. Hodgkin, ib. 1898. Consult also: Maria Webb, *The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall and their Friends*, London, 1865; W. Tallack, *George Fox, the Friends, and Early Baptists*, London, 1868; B. Rhodes, *Three Apostles of Quakerism*, ib. 1884; Jane Budge, *Glimpses of Fox and his Friends*, ib. 1893; E. E. Taylor, *Cameos from the Life of George Fox*, ib., 1908; *DNB*, xx. 117–122, and, in general, the literature under FRIENDS, SOCIETY OF.

FOX (FOXE), JOHN: Author of the *Book of Martyrs;* b. in Boston (100 m. n. of London), Lincolnshire, 1516; d. in London Apr. 15, 1587. He studied at Oxford, and became fellow of Magdalen College, where he applied himself to church history. Dean Nowell, Hugh Latimer, and William Tyndale were among his intimate friends and correspondents. For his Protestant sentiments he seems to have been expelled from his college. He became tutor in Sir Thomas Lucy's family, and then to the children of the Earl of Surrey for five years. During this period he issued several tracts and a *Sermon of John Oecolampadius to Yong Men and Maydens* (London, 1550?). After the accession of Mary he was obliged to seek refuge from persecution on the Continent. He met Edmund Grindal at Strasburg and saw through the press in that city a volume of 212 pages on the persecution of Reformers from Wyclif to 1500, entitled *Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum maximarumque per totam Europam persecutionum a Vuicleui temporibus ad hanc usque ætatem descriptio* (1554). He went to Frankfort and sought to be a mediator in the differences between Dr. Cox and John Knox and removed from there, on Knox's departure, to Basel. Poverty forced him to apply himself to the printer's trade. Encouraged by Grindal (*Remains*, ed. W Nicholson for the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843, pp. 223 sqq.) he labored diligently on his great work on the martyrs, which appeared in Latin at Basel, 1559, and was dedicated to his former pupil, now the duke of Norfolk. Returning to England he spent much time under the roof of the duke, and attended him to the scaffold, when at the age of thirty-six he was executed for conspiring with Mary Queen of Scots. He received a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral but remained poor all his life, although an annuity from the duke of Norfolk of £20 kept him from want. Called by Archbishop Parker to subscribe to the canons, he refused, and, holding up a Greek Testa-

ment, said, "To this will I subscribe." He was fearless in the avowal of his convictions, and petitioned the queen earnestly but unsuccessfully to spare the lives of two Dutch Anabaptists.

Fox s title to fame rests upon the *Book of Martyrs*, in the compilation of which he had the assistance of Cranmer and others. The first complete English edition appeared in London, 1563 (2d ed., 1570; 3d, 1576; 4th, 1583; etc.), with the title *Actes and monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church from the yeare of our Lorde a thousande, to the tyme now present, etc.* Of the numerous later editions mention may be made of those of S. R. Cattley, with dissertation by J. Townsend (8 vols., London, 1837–49) and J. Pratt, with introduction by J. Stoughton (8 vols., London, 1877). The work has been often abridged as by M. H. Seymour (London, 1838). For list of other writings by Fox, cf. the *Lives of the British Reformers* (London, 1873). By order of Elizabeth a copy of the Book of Martyrs was placed in the common halls of archbishops, bishops, deans, etc., and in all the colleges and chapels throughout the kingdom. It exercised a great influence upon the masses of the people long after its author was dead. Nicholas Ferrar (q.v.) had a chapter of it read every Sunday evening in his community of Little Gidding along with the Bible. The Roman Catholics early attacked it, and pointed out its blunders. Fox was not in all cases accurate or dispassionate, but he was a man of wonderful industry. His book was a book for the times and produced a salutary impression.

D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: The earliest and popular life, the authorship of which is not known, is unreliable and not self-consistent; it was prefixed to vol. ii. of the *Actes and Monuments*, edition of 1641; biographical notes of value were prefixed by Richard Day in his edition of *Christus Triumphans*, 1579; G. Townsend, *Life and Defence of J. Foxe*, London, 1841 (prefixed to the 1841 edition of the *Actes and Monuments*, careless and incorrect, bettered in the 3d ed. by J. Pratt, 1870). An elaborate memoir, with indefinite reference to sources, is in *DNB*, xx. 141–150.

FOX, JOHN: Presbyterian; b. at Doylestown, Pa., Feb. 13, 1853. He was graduated at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., in 1872 and Princeton Theological Seminary in 1876. He held pastorates at Hampden Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., 1877–82, North Presbyterian Church, Allegheny, Pa., 1882–93, and Second Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, 1893–98. Since 1898 he has been corresponding secretary of the American Bible Society. He is also a member of the board of directors and board of trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary and of the board of foreign missions of the Presbyterian Church. In theology he is a conservative Calvinist, and emphasizes his belief in the plenary and verbal inspiration of the Scriptures.

FOX, NORMAN: Baptist; b. at Glens Falls, New York, Feb. 13, 1836; d. in New York City June 23, 1907 He was graduated at the University of Rochester in 1855 and Rochester Theological Seminary in 1857 He was pastor of the Baptist church at Whitehall, N. Y., 1859–62, and chaplain of the Seventy-Seventh New York Volunteers, Army of the Potomac, 1862–64. In 1868–69 he edited the *Central Baptist* (St. Louis, Mo.), and from 1869 to 1874 was professor in the school of theology in William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. After 1874 he was engaged in literary and religious work, being temporary editor of *The National Baptist* in 1881, assistant editor of *The Independent* in 1884–85, and editor of the *Colloquium* (New York) in 1889–90. He wrote *A Layman's Ministry* (New York, 1883); *Preacher and Teacher: A Life of Thomas Rambaut, LL.D.* (1892); and *Christ in the Daily Meal* (1898).

FOX (FOXE), RICHARD: English statesman, bishop of Winchester; b. at Ropesley, near Grantham (23 m. s.s.w. of Lincoln), Lincolnshire, c. 1448; d. at Winchester Oct. 5, 1528. He was educated at Winchester, at Magdalen College, Oxford, and at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and afterward studied theology and canon law in Paris, where he became a favorite of Henry, Earl of Richmond, then in exile. Henry entrusted him with the conduct of negotiations with the French court in the interest of an invasion of England, and, on his accession to the throne as Henry VII., conferred on him the offices of principal secretary of state and lord privy seal, and in 1487 appointed him bishop of Exeter. In 1492 Fox was translated to the see of Bath and Wells, in 1494 to that of Durham, and in 1501 to Winchester. Throughout the reign of Henry VII. his influence was supreme in affairs of State. He negotiated several important treatises with Austria, France, and Scotland, and arranged for the marriage of Princess Margaret with James IV. of Scotland. He was also chancellor of the University of Cambridge (1500), master of Pembroke Hall (1507–19), and one of the executors of Henry VII. Under Henry VIII. he was gradually succeeded, both in royal favor and political influence, by his former protégé, Thomas Wolsey. In 1516 he resigned the custody of the privy seal and retired to his diocese. Besides making liberal donations to numerous churches, hospitals and colleges, including Magdalen College, Oxford, and Pembroke College, Cambridge, he established and endowed schools at Taunton and Grantham, and founded (1516) Corpus Christi College, Oxford, which was the pioneer college of the Renaissance in the English universities. He established in the new institution a lectureship in Greek, which until then had not been officially recognized at either Oxford or Cambridge, brought over the Italian humanist, Ludovicus Vives, as reader of Latin, and required the reader of theology, in his interpretations of Scripture, to give the preference to the Greek and Latin Fathers rather than to scholastic commentators. Fox contributed to a little book entitled, *A Contemplation of Sinners* (London, 1499), edited the *Processional* (Rouen, 1508), and translated the rule of St. Benedict (London, 1517).

Bibliography: *The Register of Richard Fox, ed. by E. C. Batten, . with a Life of Bishop Fox*, London, 1889 (only 100 copies printed); *DNB*, xx. 150–156 (where other sources are indicated).

FOX, WILLIAM JOHNSON: English Unitarian; b. at Uggeshall Farm, Wrentham (20 m. s.e. of

Norwich), Mar. 1, 1786; d. in London June 3, 1864. He attended the Independent College at Homerton (a northeast suburb of London) under John Pye Smith, 1806–09, but was chiefly self-educated; was pastor at Fareham, Hampshire (1809), at Chichester (1812), and in London (1817–1852), where a chapel was built especially for him (1824) in Finsbury. His great aim was to benefit the working classes, from which he had himself sprung, and he ultimately gave more time and effort to social and political questions than to theology, and made preaching subordinate to journalism and agitation. He was one of the chief orators of the Anticorn Law League, and was Member of Parliament, 1847–52, 1852–57, 1857–63. He was one of the editors of *The Monthly Repository*, the leading Unitarian periodical, and from 1831 to 1836 as sole editor and proprietor made it the medium of expression for his social and political views, combined with literary criticism. His *Works* were collected in a *Memorial Edition*, ed. W. B. Hodgson and H. J. Slack (12 vols., London, 1865–68).

Bibliography: A memoir is prefixed to vol. xii. of his *Works* (ut sup.). Consult *DNB*, xx. 137–139.

FRANCE.

I. The Roman Catholic Church.
Concordats, Organic Articles (§ 1).
Organization (§ 2).
The Clergy (§ 3).
Religious Orders (§ 4).
Separation of Church and State (§ 5).
Effect of Separation on Clergy (§ 6).
II. Protestant Churches.
1. The Reformed Church.
2. The Lutheran Church.
3. Evangelical Work in France.

France is a republic in the west of Europe with an area of 207,054 square miles and a population (legal, 1906) of 39,252,245. There has been no religious census since 1872. The Roman Catholics have been estimated to number from 36,000,000 to 37,500,000; the Protestants 600,000 to 2,000,000; the Jews about 86,000; and there are about 150,000 of other religions.

I. The Roman Catholic Church: From about 1813, the year of the Fontainebleau Concordat with Napoleon I., till about 1880, the Church had a tranquil development, which was only very transiently disturbed (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, VI., 1). The Concordat of 1813, to be sure, was modeled after that of 1801; but it alleviated in a great measure the executive rulings added to the former by Napoleon; because the pope abandoned the temporal power of the Church. The Concordat of 1801 (see Concordats, ut sup.) was published at the same time as the *Articles organiques*, which were arbitrarily formulated by Napoleon. The seventy-seven Organic Articles practically enforced a progressive application of the Gallicanism of 1682 (see Gallicanism), which the professors were expressly bound, under art. 24, to teach in their seminaries. The State's *placet*, in relation to all documents of the curia designed to be operative in France, was distinctly set forth in art. 1; the State's authorization with reference to every representative of the pope in the land was emphasized in art. 2; art. 20 forbade a bishop to leave his diocese without the State's permission; art. 58 ordered that there should be an organization of ten archbishoprics and fifty bishoprics, and arts. 65–66 provided for their modest allowance of 15,000 and 10,000 francs, which remained the same amount until 1906. The parochial clergy's allowances as well were regulated in art. 66. Through the Organic Articles the magisterial power of the State as affecting the Church came to be operative to the widest extent; though upon the restoration of the monarchy the State allowed most of the enactments which were burdensome to the Church to lapse into oblivion. Hence the complete independence of the bishops from one another, each dealing directly with the pope. After 1822, however, the suffragan relationship was gradually restored. Likewise, written correspondence between the curia and the bishops was carried on independently of the State. The nomination of bishops usually took place in accordance with the recommendations of the cathedral chapters and the archbishops, just as chaplains were appointed for public institutions and in the army on the recommendations of the bishops. The Gallicanism formulated in 1682, however, succumbed more and more, in the clerical seminaries and among the clergy, to the persistent antagonism of literature and of the bishops.

1. Concordats, Organic Articles.

2. Organization.

Since the Concordat of 1801 the bishops have greatly increased in number. The present organization of the Church is as follows: archbishopric of Aix (founded before 409; vacant 614–794), with the suffragan bishoprics of Ajaccio (c. 313), Digne (c. 364), Fréjus (c. 374), Gap (before 430), Marseilles (before 314), and Nice (before 253); archbishopric of Albi (before 406; raised to archbishopric 1678), with the suffragan bishoprics of Cahors (c. 250), Mende (before 314), Perpignan (see at Elne, 571–1602), and Rodez (before 506); archbishopric of Auch (before 396; raised to archbishopric 879), with the suffragan bishoprics of Aire (c. 506), Bayonne (c. 980), and Tarbes (c. 394); archbishopric of Avignon (before 353; raised to archbishopric 1475), with the suffragan bishoprics of Montpellier (see at Maguelone c. 585–1527), Nîmes (c. 394), Valence (c. 344), and Viviers (before 432); archbishopric of Besançon (c. 180), with the suffragan bishoprics of Belley (c. 412), Nancy (1777), St. Dié (1777), Toul (c. 338; united to Nancy 1801), and Verdun (c. 346); archbishopric of Bordeaux (c. 314), with the suffragan bishoprics of Agen (before 358), Angoulême (before 406), La Rochelle (see at Maillerais 1317–1648), Luçon (1317), Périgueux (before 356), and Poitiers (before 350), also in the French colonies the three bishoprics of Réunion (St. Denis; 1850), Guadeloupe (Basse-Terre; 1850), and Martinique (St. Pierre; 1851); archbishopric of Bourges (before 280), with the suffragan bishoprics of Clermont (c. 250), Le Puy (before 451), Limoges (before 73), St. Flour (1318), and Tulle (1317); archbishopric of Cambrai (580; raised to archbishopric 1559, bishopric 1801–41), with the suffragan bishopric

of Arras (c. 500; vacant 545–1093); archbishopric of Chambéry (1775; raised to archbishopric 1817), with the suffragan bishoprics of Annecy (1822), St. Jean-de-Maurienne (c. 577), and Tarentaise (see at Moutiers; c. 420); archbishopric of Lyons (c. 150), with the suffragan bishoprics of Autun (c. 270), Dijon (1731), Grenoble (381), Langres, (before 220), and St. Claude (1742); archbishopric of Paris (c. 100; raised to archbishopric 1622), with the suffragan bishoprics of Blois (1697), Chartres (before 390), Meaux (before 549), Orléans (before 344), and Versailles (1802); archbishopric of Reims (c. 290), with the suffragan bishoprics of Amiens (c. 303), Beauvais (c. 250), Châlons (c. 290), and Soissons (c. 290); archbishopric of Rennes (358; raised to archbishopric 1859), with the suffragan bishoprics of Quimper (c. 444), St. Brieuc (860), and Vannes (c. 448); archbishopric of Rouen (c. 250), with the suffragan bishoprics of Bayeux (c. 390), Coutances (c. 429), Evreux (c. 412), and Séez (2d century); archbishopric of Sens (c. 275), with the suffragan bishoprics of Moulins (1817), Nevers (c. 505), and Troyes (before 344); archbishopric of Toulouse (c. 257; raised to archbishopric 1317), with the suffragan bishoprics of Carcassonne (before 589), Montauban (1317), and Pamiers (1295); and archbishopric of Tours (c. 250), with the suffragan bishoprics of Angers (before 372), Laval (1855), Le Mans (before 451), and Nantes (before 374). [The above dates have been supplied by the editors from P B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiæ catholicæ* (Regensburg, 1872), and in many cases they are too early, especially those for Limoges and Paris, both of which were probably founded about 250. Fifty-seven sees, not included in the list given above were suppressed by Napoleon in 1801; and a few others have gone out of existence at various times.]

3. The Clergy.

The clergy subordinated to the bishops, apart from the cathedral chapters, were variously graded with respect to their official powers and the State allowances. The number of vicars-general in 1904 was 185; and these were paid by the State 2,500 francs a year (18 were paid 3,500 francs); the canons received, until 1885, a State stipend of 1,000 francs each. Among the parochial clergy, the majority of those officiating in dependent churches were distinguished, by the State's request, from the parish priests, or *curés*, as *desservants* (see CHAPLAIN) and *vicaires* (curates). In 1904 there were 31,000 of these clerical assistants, of whom 18,420 were paid 900 francs, while those over sixty years of age received 1,000 to 1,300 francs. Those incumbents who by the Concordat's terms were designated as priests of the first class (1,121) received an allowance from the State of 1,500 and 1,600 francs; and priests of the second class (2,530) 1,200 francs. The *prêtres habituels* (about 4,000), employed more and more frequently in the cities, received smaller amounts. These regulations and the State allowances continued in force until 1906.

The repeal of the Concordat on the side of the State, and the separation law of December 11, 1905, radically altered the situation of the Church. Besides the public instruction law of 1886 had already begun to drive the clergy out of the schools, and the so-called association law of July 1, 1901, had nearly done away with the congregations and religious orders. The law of 1886 decreed that all public instruction should be given only by teachers outside of the clergy; so that no priest can set foot in the schools to give religious instruction, which hereafter can be given only in premises belonging to the Church, and only privately to voluntary pupils. Despite all this, the continued maintenance of schools under church administration, with clergy or sisters as teachers, was still possible, since free instruction under State supervision was not forbidden. Accordingly, on January 1, 1899, the ratio of such schools to State schools was as three to four. The statistical compilation of these facts was promoted by the law of 1901, which was aimed particularly against the existence and the educational activity of religious orders. Even as far back as 1880 the Jesuits had been banished from France, though the measure was not completely carried out; but in 1901 all orders not approved by the State were forbidden to teach in the schools. There were sanctioned only five male orders: the Congregations for Foreign Missions, the Lazarists, the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, the Sulpicians, and the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The latter alone were a brotherhood for teaching and, like the rest, had in law the rights of a person. These rights were not accorded to the female congregations; but their local establishments had received specific authorization. Hence there were 905 congregations of women which were approved by the State. In 1890 the membership of female congregations amounted to about 130,000. While there were only some twenty actual congregations of women, with numerous establishments scattered through the country, the number of unauthorized associations far exceeded the 905 approved ones. The external motive for the Law for the separation of the Church from the State, passed Dec. 11, 1905, and in force since Jan. 1, 1906, lay in the disputed construction of the State's right to nominate bishops, and in the application of art. 20 of the Organic Articles to episcopal attendance before the pope in Rome. Only rarely in the days of the monarchical governments had any difference of opinion occurred in relation to a bishop, and in 1884 the pope effectually refused recognition of a bishop nominated by the government. Not until 1903 was it definitely demanded by the State that the nomination be recognized as an episcopal appointment. The law of separation first of all repeals all State and municipal appropriations for public worship. Establishments of worship are declared to be abrogated and are to be reconstructed as religious associations (Law of July 1, 1901), to which the property of the abrogated ecclesiastical establishments becomes transferred. For the organization of such associations there is needed a quorum of but seven persons in communities of less than 1,000 inhabitants; fifteen in communities of 1,000 to 20,000, etc.; and only twenty-five in communities with more than 200,000 inhabitants. The churches and chapels, epis-

4. Religious Orders.

5. Separation of Church and State.

copal palaces, and parsonages are declared the property of the State and the communes, and are loaned to the religious associations for a term of two to five years. These associations have to furnish, on occasion of general annual conventions of their members, exact financial reports with respect to their economic activity. Should no religious association be organized in places where church property existed, the latter is transferred to the communal institutions for charitable purposes. The use of churches for divine service is permitted only by virtue of annual notifications to the civil authorities pending the term of their use. Religious insignia or symbols on buildings or on any public site are forbidden. Incumbents who had served upward of twenty years are allowed a pension; the others, proportional allowances of their former stipend, for a term of four years.

6. Effect of Separation on Clergy.

The entire law ignores the Church as such, and treats religion as a concern for voluntary associations on the part of the citizens. On the other hand, the Church has complete freedom on the side of its organization, its hierarchy, discipline, and liturgical arrangements (except as regards the announcement of the appointed times of divine service).

The pope, in a proclamation to the French episcopate, declared it to be incompatible with the canonical regulations of the Church to comply with the law of separation; so that some other plan must be devised for the execution of the law, if it is to be carried out without too prolonged disturbances of domestic and ecclesiastical peace. The question of financial provision will the more pressingly assert itself with reference to the parochial clergy; seeing that the cathedral chapters and the scholastic establishments for the clergy had to be supported from the episcopal revenues for the last twenty years. In 1885 the theological faculties attached to the universities were likewise abrogated; and only the vicars-general continued to draw an actually significant State allowance (3,000 to 5,000 francs). Henceforward, indeed, the bishops alone will nominate all their provincial dignitaries, whereas hitherto the so-called titularies of the cathedral chapter were named by the State; while only the remainder, the honoraries, obtained the canonical rank pursuantly to the episcopal election. As a matter of course, the bishops also received power to make all parochial appointments; although in this connection the distinction as to *desservants* is no longer observed. The dissolution of the religious congregations occasioned much concern for the bishops, as the administrative activity of these societies came to an end; although many individual fraternity clerics continued their labors.

WILHELM GOETZ.

II. Protestant Churches. — 1. The Reformed Church: Until 1906, when Church and State were separated, the legal status of the Reformed churches in France rested on the law of April 8, 1802 (afterward altered and extended by the law of March 26, 1852). Each congregation was to have its presbytery, chosen by general vote, over which was to be the consistory, usually including several congregations, and five consistories were to form a provincial synod (these synods, however never came into existence). Up to 1872 the Church had no power to summon a general synod; at its head was only an advisory commission, the *Conseil central*, which was by no means equal to a synod. From the beginning of the nineteenth century there were two parties in the Church, the orthodox and the liberal, that at first lived together in peace, but at last the peace was broken by the liberals. The famous preacher Adolphe Monod (q.v.) was removed from office because of a bitter sermon against the despisers of the Lord's Supper (April 15, 1831). However, at that time the liberals had not abandoned all positive belief. They still believed in historic Christianity and in miracles. This was soon changed under the influence of the new school of theology, and gradually even the orthodox party deserted the old doctrines and laid stress on only the chief dogmas and on the facts of Bible history. The liberals went still further, attacked the authority of the Bible, and denied not only the divinity, but even the sinlessness of Christ. The founding of the Union Protestante Libérale and Renan's *Vie de Jésus* (Paris, 1863) hastened the crisis. The split was widened at the conferences of pastors held in Paris every year, and at the one in the year 1864 Guizot proposed and carried a declaration of faith in the immanence of God in the world, the inspiration and authority of Scripture, the divinity, the immaculate conception, and the resurrection of Christ. The liberals took revenge at the conference of Nîmes; and 121 men were compelled to separate themselves and form the Conférence Nationale Évangélique du Midi, which subscribed to the declaration of Guizot. The strife was renewed the next two years; another declaration of belief in the Apostles' Creed and the authority of Scripture was made, so that the liberals were forced to secede. From now on the orthodox party worked for the calling of a general synod, in which they were opposed by the liberals. Finally Thiers decreed the summoning of a general synod, which met June 6, 1872. In the synod straightway appeared four parties: Right, Right Center, Left, and Left Center. The synod, which sat for a month, chiefly split upon a creed, which was finally accepted. Forty-one liberal consistories protested against the decisions of the synod; there was also a middle party which worked for the formation of an orthodox and a liberal church. The orthodox party won the day with the government, and a synod was called to publish the creed, which the liberals did not attend (Nov. 20, 1873). New elections were held for the consistories in which the liberals refused to take part. At last in 1877 there were again new elections in which the liberals did take part, since the government allowed them to treat the decrees of the synod according to their conscience. The liberals and the orthodox then lived under the régime of the official union with common consistories. The orthodox part of the Church grouped the consistories that accepted the creed of 1872 into twenty-one provincial synods, over which was placed a formal general synod entrusted with the direction of the Church. The liberal part of the Church was represented by a

committee, the Délégation Libérale. On Dec. 11, 1905, Parliament voted and promulgated a law which decreed the separation of Church and State. The two parties, the orthodox and the liberal, are now utterly separate. A third party, the Center, which had at first tried in vain to unite the two others, forms now a third church. The three churches are called: the Église Réformée Évangélique (orthodox), the Union d'Églises Réformées de France (Center), and the Églises Réformées Unies (liberal).—In 1848 Frédéric Monod (q.v.) and others seceded from the State Church and in 1849 formed the Union des Églises Évangéliques, generally called the Free Church. At first it numbered fifty congregations, but subsequently many returned to the State Reformed Church. See the articles GALLICAN CONFESSION; HUGUENOTS; and FRENCH REVOLUTION.

2. **The Lutheran Church**: Before 1906 the status of the Lutheran Church also depended upon the laws of 1802 and 1852. The consistories, however, were to form an inspection, and the inspectors were chosen for life. The Church had a central governing body, the head consistory, in two divisions, one legislative and one administrative. This state of affairs lasted until the Franco-Prussian war, when the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, which contained six of the eight inspections, shook the Lutheran Church of France to its foundations and compelled it to enter upon a struggle for existence. The two inspections which were left (Montbéliard and Paris [including Algeria]) were at first suspicious of each other, and that of Montbéliard wished to join the Reformed churches. A general synod, summoned July 23, 1872, brought peace; and a proposition for union with the Reformed Church was voted down, likewise a creed submitted by the Pietistic minority. They passed, however, a project for reorganization of the Church, brought forward by the minority. The head consistory was given up and the Church was divided into two synodal districts, Montbéliard and Paris, almost wholly independent of each other. The inspectors were named for only nine years. There was a general synod constituted for the government of the Church, to meet alternately at Paris and at Montbéliard. The theological faculty at Strasburg was replaced by one at Paris. Owing to the disturbed condition of France after the war, this scheme was not sanctioned by the two chambers and carried into effect until 1880. At the separation of Church and State in 1905, the synod adapted the constitution of the Church to the law of separation, and named the Church the Église Évangélique Luthérienne de France. The parishes became *Associations cultuelles*. C. PFENDER.

3. **Evangelical Work in France**: Samuel Vincent says, "After the Revolution the French Protestants experienced a profound tranquillity very much like indifference. Religion possessed little interest for them, as it did for most Frenchmen; for them as for many others the eighteenth century was still in existence. The law of 1802 insured tranquillity and so relieved them and their pastors from all anxiety for the support of their form of worship, but at the same time that it removed the chief cause of unrest it also did away with that of awakening. The pastors preached their sermons, the people heard them, the consistories met, the service retained all its forms, but no one was interested or troubled about it; religion was outside the sphere of every one's daily life." This condition of things lasted until the third decade of the century when the religious awakening came from Switzerland into France and gave new life to the Church. It roused especially a glowing zeal for missions, and Evangelical work of all kinds was undertaken with great eagerness. The famous society of Evangelical missions among the heathen was founded in 1822, Bible societies were formed (see BIBLE SOCIETIES, II., 2), also several other societies for Evangelical work in France. This great display of missionary zeal, however, has another side: French Protestantism up to the middle of the last century produced nothing noteworthy in theology. But since then matters have improved, societies have been formed, periodicals have been begun, and many learned works have been written. In this work the Lutheran Church has had its share; and the church at Paris especially has become a spiritual force. Since 1896 the Lutheran Church has maintained a mission in Madagascar. The Methodists in France have twenty-five parishes, the Baptists twenty-nine.

C. PFENDER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the Catholic Church in general consult: *Gallia Christiana*, 16 vols., Paris, 1715–1865; J. H. Albanès, *Gallia Christiana novissima*, vol. i., Valence, 1899; W. H. Jervis, *The Gallican Church 1516–1789*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1872; idem, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution*, London, 1882; E. de Pressensé, *L'Église de France pendant la révolution*, Paris, 1890; É. V. Maumus, *La République et la politique de l'église*, Paris, 1892; C. F. Bellet, *Les Origines des églises de France et les fastes épiscopaux*, ib. 1898; E. Biré, *Le Clergé de France pendant le révolution, 1789–1799*, Lyons, 1901; L. Bourgain, *L'Église de France et l'état au 19 siècle*, 2 vols., Paris, 1901; W. M. Sloane, *The French Revolution and Religious Reform, 1789–1804*, London, 1901; *Archives de l'hist. religieuse de la France*, Paris, 1902 sqq.; F. V. A. Aulard, *La Révolution française et les congrégations*, ib. 1903; L. Launay, *Hist. de l'église gauloise jusqu'à la conquête franque, 511*, 2 vols., ib. 1906.

On the concordats consult: J. Baissac, *Le Concordat de 1801 et les articles organiques*, Paris, 1902; A. Body, *Le Concordat; son histoire 1801–1903*, Lyons, 1903; F. D. Matthieu, *Le Concordat de 1801*, Paris, 1903; A. Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de concordat*, ib. 1905; E. Sévestre, *L'Histoire, le texte et la destinée du concordat de 1801*, ib. 1905.

On the clergy and the orders consult: *Recueil des actes, titres et mémoires concernant les affaires du clergé de France*, 12 vols., Paris, 1716; E. Méric, *Le Clergé et les temps nouveaux*, ib. 1892; A. Dessaine, *Le Clergé français au 20. siècle*, ib. 1897; S. Grenier, *Nos évêques*, ib. 1900; E. Lesne, *La Hiérarchie épiscopale en Gaule et Germane, 742–882*, Lille, 1905; *Le Clergé français* (annual); E. Keller, *Les Congrégations religieuses en France*, Paris, 1880; L. A. Rémondière, *Les Congrégations religieuses, le fisc, le parlement et le cour de cassation*, ib. 1892; G. Surugue, *Régime légal des congrégations religieuses en France*, ib. 1898; Beaunier, *La France monastique*, new ed., ib. 1905; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques;* Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*.

On the separation of Church and State and its consequences consult: J. A. C. Sykes, *The New Reign of Terror in France*, London, 1903; J. L. E. Combes, *Une campagne laïque, 1902–03*, Paris, 1904; G. Berry, *Une page d'hist.: la séparation des églises et de l'état à la chambre des députés*, ib. 1905; A. Briand, *La Séparation des églises et de l'état. Rapport au nom de la commission de la chambre des députés*, ib. 1905; P. Grunebaum Ballin, *La Séparation des églises et de l'état*, ib. 1905; J. Roche, *La Séparation de l'église et de l'état*, ib. 1883; Berard, *Essai his-*

torique sur la séparation de l'église et de l'état pendant la révolution, ib. 1905; A. Debidour, *L'Église catholique et l'état, 1870–96*, vol. i., ib. 1906; R. Bertin et J. Charpentier, *Manuel des associations déclarées*, ib. 1907; J. E. C. Bodley, *The Church in France*, London, 1906; A. Galton, *Church and State in France, 1300–1907*, London, 1907; E. Barbier, *Le Progrès du libéralisme catholique en France sous . . Léon XIII.*, 2 vols., Paris, 1907; J. N. Brodhead, *The Religious Persecution in France, 1900–06*, London, 1907; E. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la troisième république*, Paris, 1907. See also under CHURCH AND STATE.

On Protestantism in France consult: T. Beza, *Hist. ecclésiastique de France*, ed. P. Vessor, 2 vols., Toulouse, 1882; D'Huisseau, *La Discipline des églises réformées de France*, Geneva, 1666; G. de Félice, *Hist. des synodes nationaux de l'église réformée de France*, Paris, 1864; idem, *Hist. des protestants de France*, Toulouse, 1880; idem, *Les Protestants d'autre fois*, 4 vols., Paris, 1897–1902; G. Weber, *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Calvinismus in Frankreich bis zur Aufhebung des Edikts von Nantes*, Heidelberg, 1836; A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des réformateurs*, 9 vols., Geneva, 1866–97; E. Bersier, *Hist. du synode général de l'église réformée de France*, 2 vols., Paris, 1872; E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. H. L. Bordier, Paris, 1877 sqq.; L. Aguesse, *Hist. de l'établissement du protestantisme en France*, 4 vols., ib. 1882–86; A. Lods, *La Législation des cultes protestants 1787–1887*, ib. 1889; N. A. F. Puaux, *Hist. du protestantisme en France*, ib. 1894; J. B. Maraval, *Le Protestantisme au 16. et 19. siècle*, Albi, 1900; E. Belleroche, *Successive Events that finally Led to the Edict of Nantes*, New York, 1901; C. Durand, *Hist. du protestantisme français pendant la révolution et l'empire*, Paris, 1902; C. Coignet, *L'Évolution du protestantisme français au 19. siècle*, ib. 1907; *Bulletin historique et littéraire de la société de l'hist. du protestantisme français* (a monthly); *Actes et décisions du synode des églises réformées de France*; E. Davaine and A. Lods, *Annuaire du protestantisme français*, Paris, 1892 sqq.; S. Beaujour, *L'Église réformée de France unié à l'état, son organisation codifiée*, Caen, 1883; and the literature under such articles as COLIGNI; HUGUENOTS; JANSENISM, and NANTES, EDICT OF. For the Lutheran Churches consult W. Jackson, *Recueil des documents relatifs à la réorganisation de l'église de la confession d'Augsbourg*, Paris, 1881; *L'Église luthérienne de Paris pendant la révolution*, ib. 1892.

FRANCE, CONGREGATION OF. See GENEVIEVE, SAINT, ORDERS OF, 1.

FRANCICA-NAVA DI BONTIFE, frān″chî″cā′-nā″vā′ dî bon″tî″fê′, **GIUSEPPE:** Cardinal; b. at Catania (54 m. n.n.w. of Syracuse), Sicily, July 23, 1846. After the completion of his studies and a successful career as a priest, he was consecrated titular bishop of Alabenda in 1883, and six years later was made titular archbishop of Heraclea and appointed papal nuncio to Brussels. He was then nuncio at Madrid, and in 1895 was enthroned archbishop of Catania. He was created cardinal priest of Santi Giovanni e Paolo in 1899, and is a member of the Congregations of the Council, Index, Studies, and Ceremonial.

FRANCIS, SAINT, OF ASSISI, AND THE FRANCISCAN ORDER.

I. Life of Saint Francis.
Boyhood and Early Manhood (§1).
The Beginning of the Brotherhood (§ 2).
Work and Extension of the Brotherhood (§ 3).
The Last Years of Francis (§ 4).
II. The Three Rules of the Order and the Testament of Saint Francis.
The First Rule (§ 1).
The Rule of 1221 (§ 2).
The Third Rule (§3).
The Testament (§ 4).
III. Development of the Order after the Death of Francis.
Dissensions During the Life of Francis (§ 1).
Development to 1239. The Laxer Party (§ 2).
To 1274. Bonaventura (§ 3).
To 1300. Continued Dissensions (§ 4).
Temporary Success of the Stricter Party. Persecution (§ 5).
Renewed Controversy on the Question of Poverty (§ 6).
Separate Congregations (§ 7).
Unsuccessful Attempts to Unite the Order (§ 8).
IV Spread of the Order in Modern Times.
New Congregations (§ 1).
Present Status (§ 2).
Distinguished Names (§ 3).
V. The Clarisses or Poor Clares.
VI. The Third Order.
Origin and Rule (§ 1).
New Arrangements of Leo XIII. (§ 2).

From the designation *Fratres minores* the members of the Franciscan order were called Minorites, and in England they were popularly called Grey Friars from the color of their dress.

I. Life of Saint Francis: Giovanni Bernardone, commonly known as Francesco, the founder of the Franciscan order, was born in the little town of Assisi, in Central Italy, between Perugia and Foligno, in 1182. His father Pietro, a well-to-do merchant, gave the boy a good education. The name of Francesco ("the Frenchman"), by which his baptismal name was soon altogether replaced, is said to have been given him soon after his birth by his father, returning to Assisi from a trip to France; according to another account it was due to his early acquisition of the French language. Francis showed little inclination to concern himself with his father's business, but lived a gay life with the young men of his own age. In 1201 he joined a military expedition against Perugia, was taken prisoner, and spent a year as a captive. It is probable that his conversion to more serious thoughts was gradual. It is said that when he began to avoid the sports of his former companions, and they asked him laughingly if he were thinking of marrying, he answered "Yes, a fairer bride than any you have ever seen"—meaning his "lady poverty," as he afterward used to say. He spent much time in lonely places, asking God for enlightenment. By degrees he took to nursing the most repulsive victims in the lazar-houses near Assisi; and after a pilgrimage to Rome, where he begged at the church doors for the poor, he had a vision in which he heard a voice calling upon him to restore the Church of God which had fallen into decay. He referred this to the ruined church of St. Damian near Assisi, and sold his horse together with some cloth from his father's store, giving the proceeds to the priest for this purpose. Pietro, highly indignant, attempted to bring him to his senses, first with threats and then with corporal chastisement. After a final interview in the presence of the bishop, Francis renounced all expectations from his father, laying aside even the garments received from him, and for a while was a homeless wanderer in the hills around Assisi. Returning to the town, where he spent two years at this time, he restored several ruined churches, among them the little chapel of St. Mary of the

1. Boyhood and Early Manhood.

Angels, just outside the town, which became later his favorite abode.

At the end of this period (according to Jordanus, in 1209), a sermon which he heard on Matt. x. 9 made such an impression on him that he decided to devote himself wholly to a life of apostolic poverty.

2. The Beginning of the Brotherhood. Clad in a rough garment, barefoot, and, after the Evangelical precept, without staff or scrip, he began to preach repentance. He was soon joined by a prominent fellow townsman, Bernardo di Quintavalle, who contributed all that he had to the work, and by other companions, who are said to have reached the number of eleven within a year. The brothers lived in the deserted lazar-house of Rivo Torto near Assisi; but they spent much of their time traveling through the mountainous districts of Umbria, always cheerful and full of songs, yet making a deep impression on their hearers by their earnest exhortations. Their life was extremely ascetic, though such practises were apparently not prescribed by the first rule which Francis gave them (probably as early as 1209), which seems to have been nothing more than a collection of Scriptural passages emphasizing the duty of poverty. In spite of the obvious similarity between this principle and the fundamental ideas of the followers of Peter Waldo, the brotherhood of Assisi succeeded in gaining the approval of Pope Innocent III. Many legends have clustered around the decisive audience of Francis with the pope. The realistic account in Matthew of Paris, according to which the pope originally sent the shabby saint off to keep swine, and only recognized his real worth by his ready obedience, has, in spite of its improbability, a certain historical interest, since it shows the natural antipathy of the older Benedictine monasticism to the plebeian mendicant orders.

It was not, however, a life of idle mendicancy on which the brothers entered when they set out in 1210 with the papal approbation, but one of diligent labor. Their work embraced devoted service in the abodes of sickness and poverty, earnest preaching by both priests and lay brothers, and missions in an ever widening circle, which finally included heretics and Mohammedans. They came together every year at Pentecost in the little church of the Portiuncula at Assisi, to report on their experiences and strengthen themselves for fresh efforts. There is considerable uncertainty as to the chronological and historical details of the last fifteen years of the founder's life. But to these years belong the accounts of the origin of the first houses in Perugia, Crotona, Pisa, Florence, and elsewhere (1211-13); the first attempts at a Mohammedan mission, in the sending of five brothers, soon to be martyrs, to Morocco, as well as in a journey undertaken by Francis himself to Spain, from which he was forced by illness to return without accomplishing his object; the first settlements in the Spanish peninsula and in France; and the attempts, unsuccessful at first, to gain a foothold in Germany. The alleged meeting of Francis and Dominic in Rome at the time of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) belongs to the domain of legend; even Sabatier's argument to show that such a meeting actually took place in 1218 is open to serious objection. Historical in the main are the accounts relating to the journey of Francis to Egypt and Palestine, where he attempted to convert the Sultan Kameel and gave fearless proofs of his readiness to suffer for his faith; the internal discord, which he found existing in the order on his return to Italy in 1220; the origin of his second and considerably enlarged rule, which was replaced two years later by the final form, drawn up by Cardinal Ugolino; and possibly the granting by Pope Honorius III. (in 1223) of the Indulgence of the Portiuncula—a document which Sabatier, who formerly rejected it, has recently pronounced authentic on noteworthy grounds.

3. Work and Extension of the Brotherhood.

Francis had to suffer from the dissensions just alluded to and the transformation which they operated in the originally simple constitution of the brotherhood, making it a regular order under strict supervision from Rome. Especially after Cardinal Ugolino had been assigned as protector of the order by Honorius III.—it is said at Francis' own request—he saw himself forced further and further away from his original plan. Even the independent direction of his brotherhood was, it seems, finally withdrawn from him; at least after about 1223 it was practically in the hands of Brother Elias of Crotona, an ambitious politician who seconded the attempts of the cardinal-protector to transform the character of the order. However, in the external successes of the brothers, as they were reported at the yearly general chapters, there was much to encourage Francis. Cæsarius of Speyer, the first German provincial, a zealous advocate of the founder's strict principle of poverty, began in 1221 from Augsburg, with twenty-five companions, to win for the order the land watered by the Rhine and the Danube; and a few years later the Franciscan propaganda, starting from Cambridge, embraced the principal towns of England. But none of these cheering reports could wholly drive away from the mind of Francis the gloom which covered his last years. He spent much of his time in solitude, praying or singing praise to God for his wonderful works. The canticle known as *Laudes creaturarum*, with its child-like invocations to Brother Sun, Sister Moon with the stars, Brother Wind, Sister Water, Brother Fire, and finally Sister Death, to raise their voices to the glory of God, dates from this period of his life. The hermit stage which opened the career of many monastic founders was reserved for the end of his who had once been so restless in his activity. He spent the short remainder of his life partly on Monte Alverno on the upper Arno, where he fasted forty days and longed for union with God, to be demonstrated by the impression on his body of the wounds of Christ (see STIGMATIZATION); partly at Rieti under medical treatment; and partly in his beloved Portiuncula at Assisi waiting for his deliverance from the flesh. He died Oct. 3, 1226, at Assisi, and was canonized

4. The Last Years of Francis.

two years later by Pope Gregory IX., the former cardinal-protector of the order.

II. The Three Rules of the Order and the Testament of Saint Francis: The oldest rule, referred to above, no longer preserved in its original form, seems to have contained not much more than the three Scriptural commands in Matt. xix. 21; Luke ix. 3; and Matt. xvi. 24. The attempted reconstruction by Müller ascribes to it too extensive a content, though Sabatier goes too far in the other direction when he limits it to these three sayings of Christ, which, according to Celano, formed the kernel of the rule, surrounded by certain other more detailed prescriptions. Sabatier's theory that these were gradual accretions, depending especially on decisions of the yearly general chapter, needs further evidence to confirm it; the oldest biographers say nothing of any intermediate stage between the primitive rule and that of 1221. The former, based upon the idea of poverty and self-denying labor in the cause of Christ, was intended for an association of a similar kind to the *Pauperes Catholici* or "Poor Men of Lyons." It had little or nothing in common with the older monastic rules, Benedictine or Augustinian.

1. The First Rule.

The rule of 1221 is more adapted to the needs of a monastic order intended to further the general ends of the Church and based upon the three usual vows, but laying special stress on that of poverty. It was drawn up by Francis himself, but under the influence of Cardinal Ugolino, as well as of the learned and practical Cæsarius of Speyer and apparently of Brother Leo, who from 1220 on was the constant companion of the founder. The matter of the primitive rule was included in it, but scattered among a large part of detailed directions, besides many edifying thoughts and pious outpourings of the heart, probably the work of Francis. But there is much in the new rule which breathes a different spirit. The humble founder, though refusing the title of general of the order, and appearing simply as "minister-general," sometimes with the addition "the servant of the whole brotherhood," appears now at the head of a regular monastic hierarchy, consisting of provincial ministers over the provinces, *custodes* over smaller districts, and guardians over single houses. Definite rules for the novitiate, the habit, hours of prayer, and the discipline of the houses were modeled after the older monastic tradition. In place of the informal yearly gatherings of the brotherhood, there are now regular chapters at fixed times. Of special interest are the provisions for apostolic poverty and the ascetic life in general, which show this rule to be essentially a development of the older discipline, with the obligation of poverty made more strict while that of other ascetic practises was mitigated, partly for the reason that the new *Fratres minores* were expected to be diligently occupied in exhausting labors.

2. The Rule of 1221.

The third rule, confirmed by Honorius III. on Nov. 29, 1223, has still less of Francis' own work in it. The edifying tone, the citation of the Scriptural texts, have disappeared from it. Instead of the strong emphasis upon Christ's admonitions to his disciples with which the rule of 1221 had begun, the enumeration of the three traditional monastic vows is here substituted. The character of the order as a mendicant order, pledged to an ideal of the strictest poverty, comes out here, it is true; but these concessions to the spirit of the earlier rules are intermingled with a number of other prescriptions which clearly show the externally official character of the new statutes, framed in the interest of the papacy and in conformity with the other organs of the hierarchy. A cardinal appointed by the pope as protector of the whole order was to supervise its activity. The conditions for entrance are more definitely laid down; the Roman Breviary is expressly named as the obligatory basis of the daily devotions of priests belonging to it; and the preaching brothers have a more dependent position than before. In a word, the life here regulated is no longer the old free, wandering life of the first years, marked by apostolic poverty and loving, simple-hearted devotion to the Lord, but rather a carefully arranged quasi-monastic system, shorn of much of its original freedom.

3. The Third Rule.

Francis, as may be seen from more than one passage in the accounts of his last years, was unhappy about these changes. As a demonstration against them, he left what is called his "Testament," whose occasional reading together with the rule was enjoined on the brethren. Its tone is rather plaintive than angry; it looks back in a spirit of regret to the primitive days of the first love. It urges unswerving obedience to the pope and the heads of the order, but at the same time emphasizes the necessity of following its principles, especially the imitation of the poverty of Christ. The brethren are commanded to oppose the introduction of any future secularizing influences, and at the same time are forbidden to ask for any special privileges from the pope. In spite of the direct command in the "Testament" against considering it as a new rule, the Observantist section of the Franciscans practically regarded it as even more binding than the formal rule, while the advocates of a less strict observance paid little attention to it, especially to its prohibition of asking for ecclesiastical privileges.

4. The Testament.

III. Development of the Order after the Death of Francis: The controversy about poverty which extends through the first three centuries of Franciscan history began in the lifetime of the founder. The ascetic brothers Matthew of Narni and Gregory of Naples, to whom Francis had entrusted the direction of the order during his absence, carried through at a chapter which they held certain stricter regulations in regard to fasting and the reception of alms, which really departed from the spirit of the original rule. It did not take Francis long, on his return, to suppress this insubordinate tendency; but he was less successful in regard to another of an opposite nature which soon came up. Elias of Crotona originated a movement for the increase of the worldly consideration of the order and the adaptation of its

1. Dissensions During the Life of Francis.

system to the plans of the hierarchy which conflicted with the original notions of the founder and helped to bring about the successive changes in the rule already described. Francis was not alone in opposition to this lax and secularizing tendency. On the contrary, the party which clung to his original views and after his death took his "Testament" for their guide, known as Observantists or *Zelanti*, was at least equal in numbers and activity to the followers of Elias. The conflict between the two lasted many years, and the *Zelanti* won several notable victories, in spite of the favor shown to their opponents by the papal administration—until finally the reconciliation of the two points of view was seen to be impossible, and the order was actually split into halves.

St. Anthony of Padua (q.v.) has usually been regarded as the first leader of the Observantists; but recent investigations have shown that he was inclined to the opposite side. When Elias sent a delegation to Rome in 1230 to obtain papal sanction for his views, Anthony was one of the envoys; and there is little doubt that the bull *Quo elongati* of Gregory IX., favoring this side, was due in large measure to his influence. The earliest leader of the strict party was rather Brother Leo, the witness of the ecstasies of Francis on Monte Alverno and the author of the *Speculum perfectionis*, a strong polemic against the laxer party. Next to him came John Parens, the first successor of Francis in the headship of the order. In 1232, however, Elias succeeded him, and administered the affairs of the order in the interest of his own party for seven years. Much external progress was made during these years; many new houses were founded, especially in Italy, and in them, without regard to the founder's depreciation of secular learning, special attention was paid to education. The somewhat earlier settlements of Franciscan teachers at the universities (in Oxford, for example, where Alexander of Hales was teaching) continued to develop. Contributions toward the promotion of the order's work came in abundantly, and Elias authorized his subordinates to get around the provision of the rule against the receiving of money, usually by the appointment of agents outside the order, who had the custody of the funds. Elias pursued with great severity the principal leaders of the opposition, and even Bernardo di Quintavalle, the founder's first disciple, was obliged to conceal himself for years in the forest of Monte Sefro.

2. Development to 1239. The Laxer Party.

At last, however, the reaction came. At the general chapter of 1239, held in Rome under the personal presidency of Gregory IX., Elias was deposed in favor of Albert of Pisa, the former provincial of England, a moderate Observantist. None the less, Elias' attitude remained widely prevalent in the order. The next two ministers-general Haymo of Faversham (1240–44) and Crescentius of Jesi (1244–47), governed to a great extent in this sense, and had the new pope Innocent IV. on their side. In a bull of Nov. 14, 1245, he even sanctioned an extension of the system of financial agents, and declared the funds in their custody the property of the Church, to be held at the disposal of the cardinal-protector and not to be alienated without his permission. The Observantist party took a strong stand in opposition to this ruling, and carried on so successfully an agitation against the lax general that in 1247, at a chapter held in Lyons, where Innocent IV. was then residing, he was replaced by the strict Observantist John of Parma (1247–57). Elias, who had been excommunicated and taken under the protection of Frederick II., was now forced to give up all hope of recovering his power in the order. He died in 1253, after succeeding by recantation in obtaining the removal of his censures. Under John of Parma, who enjoyed the favor of Innocent IV. and Alexander IV., the influence of the order was notably increased, especially by the provisions of the latter pope in regard to the academic activity of the brothers. He not only sanctioned the theological institutes in Franciscan houses, but did all he could to facilitate the entrance of their teachers to the universities, especially Paris, the headquarters of theological study. It was due to the action of his representatives, who were obliged to threaten the university authorities with excommunication, that the degree of doctor of theology was conceded to the Dominican Thomas Aquinas and the Franciscan Bonaventura (1257), who had previously been able to lecture only as licentiates. In the same year Bonaventura succeeded John of Parma. In spite of his adherence to Observantist principles, Bonaventura took a decided stand against the teaching of Joachim of Fiore, which John of Parma had been inclined to favor. Not a few of the "Spiritual" party, as they were now coming to be called, were condemned to lifelong imprisonment; and for the purpose of discouraging their extreme tendency a new life of the founder was compiled by Bonaventura, at the request of the general chapter held at Narbonne in 1260, and authorized by that of Pisa three years later as the only approved biography. Apart from the severe measures taken against Joachim's followers, Bonaventura seems to have ruled (1257–74) in a moderate spirit, which is represented also by various works produced by the order in his time—especially by the *Expositio regulæ* written by David of Augsburg (q.v.) soon after 1260.

3. To 1274. Bonaventura.

The successor of Bonaventura, Jerome of Ascoli (1274–79), the future Pope Nicholas IV., and his successor, Bonagratia (1279–85), also followed a middle course. Severe measures were taken against certain extreme Spirituals who, on the strength of the rumor that Gregory X. was intending at the Council of Lyons (1274–75) to force the mendicant orders to tolerate the possession of property, threatened both pope and council with the renunciation of allegiance. Attempts were made, however, to satisfy the reasonable demands of the Spiritual party, as in the bull *Exiit qui seminat* of Nicholas III. (1279), which pronounced the principle of complete poverty meritorious and holy, but interpreted it in the way of a somewhat sophistical distinction between pos-

4. To 1300. Continued Dissensions.

session and usufruct. The bull was received respectfully by Bonagratia and the next two generals, Arlotto of Prato (1285–87) and Matthew of Aqua Sparta (1287–89); but the Spiritual party under the leadership of the fanatical apocalyptic Pierre Jean Olivi (q.v.) regarded its provisions for the dependence of the friars upon the pope and the division between brothers occupied in manual labor and those employed on spiritual missions as a corruption of the fundamental principles of the order. They were not won over by the conciliatory attitude of the next general, Raymond Gaufredi (1289–96), and of the Franciscan pope Nicholas IV (1288–92). The attempt made by the next pope, Celestine V., an old friend of the order, to end the strife by uniting the Observantist party with his own order of hermits (see CELESTINES) was scarcely more successful. Only a part of the Spirituals joined the new order, and the secession scarcely lasted beyond the reign of the hermit-pope. Boniface VIII. annulled Celestine's bull of foundation with his other acts, deposed the general Raymond Gaufredi, and appointed a man of laxer tendency, John de Murro, in his place. The Benedictine section of the Celestines was separated from the Franciscan section, and the latter was formally suppressed by Boniface in 1302. The leader of the Observantists, Olivi, who spent his last years in the Franciscan house at Narbonne and died there in 1298, had pronounced against the extremer "Spiritual" attitude, and given an exposition of the theory of poverty which was approved by the more moderate Observantists, and for a long time constituted their principle.

Under Clement V (1305–14) this party succeeded in exercising some influence on papal decisions. In 1309 Clement had a commission sit at Avignon for the purpose of reconciling the conflicting parties.

5. Temporary Success of the Stricter Party. Persecution.

Ubertino of Casale (q.v.), the leader, after Olivi's death, of the stricter party, who was a member of the commission, induced the Council of Vienne to arrive at a decision in the main favoring his views, and the papal constitution *Exivi de paradiso* (1313) was on the whole conceived in the same sense. Clement's successor, John XXII. (1316–34), favored the laxer or conventual party. By the bull *Quorundam exigit* he modified several provisions of the constitution *Exivi*, and required the formal submission of the Spirituals. Some of them, encouraged by the strongly Observantist general Michael of Cesena, ventured to dispute the pope's right so to deal with the provisions of his predecessor. Sixty-four of them were summoned to Avignon, and the most obstinate delivered over to the Inquisition, four of them being burned (1318). Shortly before this all the separate houses of the Observantists had been suppressed.

A few years later a new controversy, this time theoretical, broke out on the question of poverty. The Spirituals contended eagerly for the view that Christ and his apostles had possessed absolutely nothing, either separately or jointly. This proposition had been declared heretical in a trial before an inquisitor. A protest was now made against this decision by the chapter held at Perugia in 1322, as well as by such influential members of the order as William Occam (q.v.), the English provincial, and Bonagratia of Bergamo. John XXII. ranged himself decidedly with the Dominicans, who combated the theory, and by the bull *Cum inter nonnullos* of 1322 declared it erroneous and heretical. Appealing from this decision, Bonagratia, Occam, and Michael of Cesena were imprisoned at Avignon for four years, until they escaped by the help of the Emperor Louis the Bavarian. Supported by him, they carried on a literary war against the papal and Dominican denial of the absolute poverty of Christ and his apostles. The pope deposed Cesena and Occam from their offices in the order, and excommunicated them with the Franciscan antipope Peter of Corvara (Nicholas V.) and all their adherents. Only a small part of the order, however, joined them, and at a general chapter held in Paris (1329) the majority of all the houses declared their submission to the pope. The same step was taken in the following year by the antipope, later by the ex-general Cesena, and finally, just before his death, by Occam.

6. Renewed Controversy on the Question of Poverty.

Out of all these dissensions in the fourteenth century sprang a number of separate congregations, almost of sects. To say nothing of the heretical parties of the Beghards and Fraticelli (qq.v.), some which developed within the order on both hermit and cenobitic principles may here be mentioned: (1) The Clareni or Clarenini, an association of hermits established on the river Clareno in the march of Ancona by Angelo di Clareno after the suppression of the Franciscan Celestines by Boniface VIII. It maintained the principles of Olivi, and, outside of Umbria, spread also in the kingdom of Naples, where Angelo died in 1337 Like several other smaller congregations, it was obliged in 1568 under Pius V. to unite with the general body of Observantists. (2) The Minorites of Narbonne. As a separate congregation, this originated through the union of a number of houses which followed Olivi after 1308. It was limited to southwestern France and, its members being accused of the heresy of the Beghards, was suppressed by the Inquisition during the controversies under John XXII. (3) The Reform of Johannes de Vallibus, founded in the hermitage of St. Bartholomew at Brugliano near Foligno in 1334. The congregation was suppressed by the Franciscan general chapter in 1354; reestablished in 1368 by Paolo de' Trinci of Foligno; confirmed by Gregory XI. in 1373, and spread rapidly from Central Italy to France, Spain, Hungary and elsewhere. Most of the Observantist houses joined this congregation by degrees, so that it became known simply as the "brothers of the regular Observance." It acquired the favor of the popes by its energetic opposition to the heretical Fraticelli, and was expressly recognized by the Council of Constance (1415). It was allowed to have a special vicar-general of its own and legislate for its members without reference to the conventual

7. Separate Congregations.

part of the order. Through the work of such men as Bernardin of Sienna (q.v.) John of Capistrano (see CAPISTRANO, GIOVANNI DI), and Dietrich Coelde (b. 1435? at Münster; was a member of the Brethren of the Common Life, q.v.; d. Dec. 11, 1515), it gained great prominence during the fifteenth century. By the end of the Middle Ages, the Observantists, with 1,400 houses, comprised nearly half of the entire order. Their influence brought about attempts at reform even among the Conventuals, including the Observantists of the Common Life, founded by Boniface de Ceva and spreading principally in France and Germany; the reformed congregation founded in 1426 by the Spaniard Philip de Berbegal and distinguished by the special importance they attached to the little hood (*cappuciola*); the Neutri, a group of reformers originating about 1463 in Italy, who tried to take a middle ground between the Conventuals and Observantists, but refused to obey the heads of either, until they were compelled by the pope to affiliate with the regular Observantists, or with those of the Common Life; the Caperolani, a congregation founded about 1470 in North Italy by Peter Caperolo, but dissolved again on the death of its founder in 1480; the Amadeists, founded by the noble Portuguese Amadeo, who entered the Franciscan order at Assisi in 1452, gathered around him a number of adherents to his fairly strict principles (numbering finally twenty-six houses) and, died in the odor of sanctity in 1482.

Projects for a union between the two main branches of the order were put forth not only by the Council of Constance but by several popes, without any positive result. By direction of Martin V., John of Capistrano drew up statutes which were to serve as a basis for reunion, and they were actually accepted by a general chapter at Assisi in 1430; but the majority of the Conventual houses refused to agree to them, and they remained without effect. At Capistrano's request Eugenius IV put forth a bull (*Ut sacra minorum*, 1446) looking to the same result, but again nothing was accomplished. Equally unsuccessful were the attempts of the Franciscan pope Sixtus IV., who bestowed a vast number of privileges on both the original mendicant orders, but by this very fact lost the favor of the Observantists and failed in his plans for reunion. Julius II. succeeded in doing away with some of the smaller branches, but left the division of the two great parties untouched. This division was finally legalized by Leo X., after a general chapter held in Rome, in connection with the reform movement of the Fifth Lateran Council, had once more declared the impossibility of reunion. The less strict principles of the Conventuals, permitting the posesssion of real estate and the enjoyment of fixed revenues, were recognized as tolerable, while the Observantists, in contrast to this *usus moderatus*, were held strictly to their own *usus arctus* or *pauper*. The latter, as adhering more closely to the rule of the founder, were allowed to claim a certain superiority over the former. The Observantist general (elected now for six years, not for life) was to have the title of "Minister-General of the Whole Order of St. Francis" and the right to confirm the choice of a head for the Conventuals, who was known as "Master-General of the Friars Minor Conventual"—although this privilege never became practically operative.

8. Unsuccessful Attempts to Unite the Order.

IV. Spread of the Order in Modern Times: The regulations of Leo X. brought a notable increase of strength to the Observantist branch, and many conventual houses joined them—in France all but forty-eight, in Germany the greater part, in Spain practically all. But this very growth was fatal to the internal unity and strength of the strict party. The need for new reforms soon became apparent, and the action of Leo X., far from consolidating the order, gave rise to a number of new branches. The most important of these are: the Capuchins (q.v.), founded in 1525 by Matteo Bassi and established in 1619 by Paul V as a separate order; the Discalced Franciscans, founded as a specially strict Observantist congregation at Bellacazar in Spain by Juan de Puebla toward the end of the fifteenth century, compelled by Leo X. to unite with the regular Observantists, but soon afterward reestablished as an independent branch by Juan de Guadelupe (d. 1580), and subsequently obtaining some importance in Spain and Portugal; the Alcantarines, a very strict congregation founded in 1540 by Peter of Alcantara (q.v.), and distinguished by remarkable achievements in the mission field; the Italian *Riformati*, founded about 1525 near Rieti by two Spanish Observantists, and becoming comparatively wide-spread from the beginning of the seventeenth century through the favor of Clement VIII. and Urban VIII.; the French Recollects, originating at Nevers in 1592, formed into a distinct congregation by Clement VIII. in 1602, and important in later missionary history, especially in Canada.

1. New Congregations.

The Franciscans also rendered important services to the cause of the Counterreformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, rivaling the Jesuit order in zeal, and frequently suffering martyrdom for their faith in England, the Netherlands, and Germany. During the last hundred years the possessions of the order have been much reduced by the storms of the French Revolution, the German secularizations since 1803, and the political changes of Spain, Italy, and France. On the other hand, there has been a considerable extension in many parts of the order, especially in North America. The present statistics of the three principal male branches of the order are approximately as follows: (1) Observantists: 1,500 houses, comprised in about 100 provinces and *Custodiæ*, with about 15,000 members of whom some 7,000 belong to the Regular Observance, 6,000 to the *Riformati*, and the rest to the Recollects and the Discalced Congregation; (2) Conventuals: 290 houses, principally in Italy, but also in Bavaria, Austria, Rumania, Turkey, etc.; and (3) Regular Tertiaries, following the rule of Leo X.: less than a score of houses—two in Rome, five in Sicily, seven in Austria, and two in America. These figures show a

2. Present Status.

great contrast to the strength of the order at the end of the Middle Ages, when it had over 8,000 houses, of which the 1,300 Observantist communities alone numbered 30,000 members, or even in the middle of the seventeenth century when there were about 70,000 members, divided into 150 provinces. The noteworthy proportional decline of the non-Observantist section shows that the order to this day presents more attraction as it remains truest to its original principles.

3. Distinguished Names.

Although surpassed in the number of prominent and influential theological authors by the Jesuits and Dominicans, the order still boasts a number of distinguished names. The first century of its existence produced the three great scholastics Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, and Duns Scotus, the "Admirable Doctor" Roger Bacon, and the well-known mystic authors and popular preachers David of Augsburg and Berthold of Regensburg. Among Franciscan celebrities of the later Middle Ages may be mentioned Nicholas of Lyra, the Biblical commentator, Bernardin of Sienna, John of Capistrano, Mollard and Menot as preachers, and the famous canonists Astesanus, Alvarus Pelagius, and Occam. Later again came sound historical investigators such as Luke Wadding and Pagi. In the field of Christian art, during the later Middle Ages, the Franciscan movement exercised considerable influence, especially in Italy. Several great painters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, especially Cimabue and Giotto, were spiritual sons of Francis in the wider sense, and the plastic masterpieces of the latter, as well as the architectural conceptions of both himself and his school, show the influence of Franciscan ideals. The Italian Gothic style, whose earliest important monument is the great convent church at Assisi (built 1228–53), was cultivated as a rule principally by members of the order or men under their influence. The early spiritual poetry of Italy was inspired by Francis himself, who was followed by Thomas of Celano, Bonaventura, and Jacopone da Todi; and in a certain sense even Dante may be included within the sphere of Franciscan influence (cf. especially *Paradiso*, xi. 50).

V. The Clarisses or Poor Clares: For the history of the female branch of the order, founded in the lifetime of Francis, see CLARA, SAINT, AND THE CLARISSES.

VI. The Third Order: The Tertiary rule which passes under the name of St. Francis not only can not have been drawn up by him, but does not even show a basis of his original instructions. There must have been, however, in his lifetime a following of devout laity who composed a sort of third order, beside the Friars Minor and the Clarisses. It seems probable that the rule drawn up in 1285 for Dominican tertiaries served as a model for the corresponding Franciscan rule mentioned by Nicholas IV. in his bull *Supra montem* of Aug. 18, 1289. This rule excludes persons living in the estate of matrimony, but does not prescribe absolute renunciation of property or the wearing of the Franciscan habit. The precepts as to fasting are comparatively mild, allowing the use of meat three times a week, and the devotional exercises required are very much less than in the first and second orders. The brothers are expressly allowed to render military service in defense of the Holy Roman Church, the Christian faith of their own fatherland. The position midway between the Church and the world taken by this rule corresponded to a need widely felt at the time, and contributed toward the spread of the mendicant principle. The growth of the third order was not without opposition. Frederick II. took severe measures against it, and now and then the Franciscan tertiaries were confused with the heretical Beghards; especially after the condemnation of this sect by the Council of Vienne, many of its members sought entrance into the third order of St. Francis or adopted its habit and manner of life, so that John XXII. was obliged to issue a special bull (*Sancta Romana*, 1317) to distinguish the true and false tertiaries. The growth of the institute continued throughout the Middle Ages, and numerous pious brotherhoods and sisterhoods grew up either within it or in close connection with it. Under Leo X. a new system went into effect (1517), separating from the general body those tertiaries who accepted a new rule drawn up for them. These took the three monastic vows, had a minister-general of their own, and could be admitted into the first order. The remainder were divided into three classes: those who lived in community, bound by simple vows, on the basis of the old rule of Nicholas IV.; those who lived alone, bound by a simple vow of celibacy, and wearing the habit of the order; and others of both sexes, single or married, who made no vows and did not live in community. The third class is by far the most numerous, and comprises all the affiliated members living in the world.

1. Origin and Rule.

It is to these that the comprehensive rearrangements refer which were ordered by Leo XIII. toward the end of the nineteenth century. In the encyclical *Auspicator* of Sept. 17, 1882, he urgently commended the third order, and dwelt upon its high usefulness in modern conditions. By the constitution *Misericors* of May 30, 1883, he made a number of changes in the obligations to be imposed on the members. No vows are now required on entrance, but a simple promise to keep the rule and wear the scapular and girdle under the ordinary clothing; a few fasts are imposed, especially on the vigils of the feasts of the Immaculate Conception and of St. Francis; the duty of monthly communion and grace before and after meals is insisted on, together with that of a generally self-denying and temperate life. These easily fulfilled regulations have brought about a marked increase in the number of members, which in the single country of Germany is estimated at about half a million. (See TERTIARIES.)

2. New Arrangements of Leo XIII.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Full lists of works on the subject are given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, vi. 197–220; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. 265–271; Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1318–21; and in the *British Museum Catalogue* under "Francis [Bernardoni]." Consult also P Robinson, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature*, New

York, 1907. The oldest and weightiest sources for a life of St. Francis are the two *Vitæ* by Thomas of Celano, the *Chronicon fratris Jordani a Jano*, the *Legenda trium sociorum* (Leo, Rufinus and Angelus Tancredi) and the celebrated *Vita* by S. Bonaventura. These, with the exception of the fuller *Vitæ* of Thomas, are collected together with a commentary in *ASB*, Oct., ii. 545–798. The principal editions and translations will be noted below. Other sources are of course the *Opera* of St. Francis, ed. Wadding, Cologne, 1849, and Horvy, Paris, 1880, made available in Eng. transl., London, 1890, and by P. Robinson, Philadelphia, 1906; and the *Sacrum commercium* (written anonymously c. 1227), Eng. transl. by M. Carmichael, London, 1901.

The best modern life is by P. Sabatier, Paris, 1894, which has run through many editions, Eng. transl., London, 1898. Sabatier edited the *Speculum perfectionis* of Leo of Assisi, Paris, 1898, of which Eng. transls. appeared by Sebastian Evans, London, 1899, Countess De la Warr, 1902, and Robert Steele, 1903. Next to these should be noted H. G. Rosedale, *St. Francis of Assisi according to Brother Thomas of Celano, with Critical Introduction*, London, 1904 (for the best edition), cf. Thomas of Celano, *The Lives of St. Francis of Assisi*, transl. by A. G. Ferrers Howell, ib., 1908. Other accounts are by K. Hase, Leipsic, 1856 (long the standard); Bernardin, 2 vols., Paris, 1880; a sumptuous work in 3 parts, *S. François d'Assise*, containing the *Vie* by F. E. Chavin de Malan, first published Paris, 1845, *S. François après sa mort* and *S. François dans l'art*, Paris, 1885; H. S. Lear, London, 1888; Miss Lockhart (from the *Legends of St. Bonaventure*), ib. 1889; J. M. S. Daurignac, Abbeville, 1887; L. Le Monnier, Paris, 1890, Eng. transl., London, 1894; J. W. Knox Little, ib. 1897; the *Duæ Legendæ* of Bonaventura, Quaracchi (near Florence), 1898; J. Adderley, London, 1900; A. Barine (*S. François . . et la legende des trois compagnons*), Paris, 1901; L. de Chérancé, Paris, 1892, Eng. transl., London, 1901; J. Herkless *Francis and Dominic*, pp. 16–80, New York, 1901; W O. E. Oesterley, London, 1901; B. Christen, Innsbruck, 1902; L. de Kerval; Paris, 1902 (a Fr. transl. of the legend of the three companions); A. Goffin, Brussels, 1902 (also a Fr. transl. of the same); E. G. Salter, London, 1902 (Eng. transl. of the same); J. H. McIlvaine, New York, 1902; Anna M. Stoddart, London, 1903; S. Bonaventura, ib. 1904 (Eng. transl.); L. L. Du Bois, New York, 1906; J. Jörgensen, *Den hellige Frans af Assisi*, Copenhagen, 1907; M. A. Heins, New York, 1908. On the portraiture consult N. H. J. Westlake, *On the Authentic Portraiture of St. Francis of Assisi*, London, 1897; O. Kuhns, *St. Francis of Assisi*, New York, 1906.

The Rules are given in L. Wadding, *S. Francisci opuscula*, Antwerp, 1623, ed. V. der Burg, Cologne, 1889, and in Horoy's edition of the *Opera* of St. Francis, Paris, 1880. Consult also *Regula antiqua fratrum et sororum de pœnitentia seu tertii ordinis S. Francois*, ed. P. Sabatier, Paris, 1901, and cf. K. Müller, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens*, pp. 4–114, 185–188, Freiburg, 1885. The *Testamentum* was edited from the Cottonian MS. in the British Museum by J. S. Brewer in *Monumenta Franciscana*, i (1858), 562–566, and is given in Sabatier's *Vie*, 9th ed., pp. 389–393.

Consult also: B. Francis, *Rule and Ceremonial of the Third Order*, London, 1883; *Manual of the Third Order*, ib. 1883; *Nouvelle régle du tiers-ordre séculier*, Paris, 1883; F. Bertinus, *Manuol of the Third Order*, London, 1884; *Little Manual of the Third Order*, ib. 1899; Gerard, *Documents pour expliquer la régle du tiers-ordre*, Paris, 1899.

For the history of the order sources are: *Chronicon fratris Jordanis a Jano*, ed. G. Voigt, vol. v. of *Abhandlungen der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, v (1870), 421 sqq. (good for Germany); *Chroniche degli ordini instituti dal S. Francesco*, in Portuguese and Spanish, 3 vols., Lisbon and Salamanca, 1556–1570, Fr. transl., 4 vols., Paris, 1600, Germ. transl., 2 vols., Constance, 1604; A. Parkinson, *Collectanea Anglo-minoritica*, London, 1726; J.H. Sbaralea, *Bullarium Franciscanum constitutiones, epistolæ, diplomata . .*, 4 vols., Rome, 1759–68 (vol. 4 by D. A. Rossi); *Analecta Franciscana*, 2 vols., Quaracchi, 1885–87 (a collection of chronicles, and various documentary sources).

Of more modern accounts the best are: L. Wadding, *Annales minorum*, vol. i.–vii., Leyden, 1625–48, vol. viii. Rome, 1654, 2d ed. begun by J. M. Fonseca, vols. i.–xvi., Rome, 1731–36, continued at intervals, vol. xxv., 1887; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*. vol. vii., cf. i., pp. lxxi. sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. 264–385. Consult also: V. Greiderer, *Germania Franciscana*, 2 vols., Innsbruck, 1777–81; G. F. C. Evers, *Analecta ad fratrum minorum historiam*, Leipsic, 1882; K. Müller, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens*, Freiburg, 1885; D. de Gubernatis, *Orbis seraphicus. Hist. de tribus ordinibus a . S. Francisco institutis*, new ed., Quaracchi, 1887 sqq.; F. Servais Dirks, *Hist. littéraire des frères mineurs en Belgique*, Antwerp, 1888; B. Hammer, *Die Franciscaner in den Vereinigten Staaten*, Cologne, 1892; A. G. Little, *The Grey Friars in Oxford*, Oxford, 1892; J. M. Stone, *Sufferings of English Franciscans during 16th and 17th Centuries*, London, 1892; O. Huettebräuker, *Der Minoritenorden*, Berlin, 1895; T. Kolde, *Die kirchlichen Bruderschaften und das religiöse Leben*, Erlangen, 1895; Thaddeus, *The Franciscans in England, 1600–1850*, London, 1898; Anne Macdowell, *Sons of Francis*, New York, 1902; D. Muzzey, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, ib., 1908.

On the Third Order consult: F. J. d'Ezerville, *Le Tiers-ordre de S. François*, Lille, 1887; Léon, *Le Tiers Ordre séraphique*, Paris, 1887; P. B. da Greccio, *Il Terz' Ordine di San Francesco*, Quaracchi, 1888; P. de Martigné, *Le Tiers-ordre . . . d'après Léon XIII.*, Le Mans, 1896; Morbert, *Les Religieuses françiscaines*, Paris, 1897; P. Baptiste, *Spirit of the Third Order of St. Francis*, London, 1899; J. G. Adderley and C. L. Marson, *"Third Orders,"* ib. 1902; F. O. Kaercher, *Summary of Indulgences, Privileges, and Favors Granted to the Secular Branch of the Third Order of St. Francis*, St. Louis, 1902; T. C. L. Josa, *St. Francis of Assisi and the Third Order*, ib. 1906.

FRANCIS BORGIA, SAINT. See JESUITS.

FRANCIS, JOSEPH MARSHALL: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Indianapolis, Ind.; b. at Eaglesmere, Pa., Apr. 6, 1862. He studied at Racine College (1879–82) and Oxford (1885–86), and was ordered deacon in 1884 and priested two years later. After being in charge of the mission churches of St. Edmund, Milwaukee, and of St. Peter, Greenfield, Wis., 1884–86, he was canon of All Saints' Cathedral, Milwaukee, 1886–87 and rector of St Luke's, Whitewater, Wis., 1887–88. He then went as a missionary to Japan, where he remained until 1897, being professor of dogmatic theology in Trinity Divinity School, Tokyo, 1891–97 and subdean of the same institution 1893–97. Returning to the United States, he was rector of St. Paul's, Evansville, Ind., 1898–99, and in 1899 was consecrated bishop of Indianapolis. In theology he is in "entire conformity with the teaching of the Episcopal Church as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer."

FRANCIS, SAINT, OF PAOLA: Founder of the Order of Minims; b. at Paola (13 m. w.n.w. of Cosenza), Italy, 1416 (according to the Bollandists), 1438; d. at Plessis-les-Tours (1 m. s.w. of Tours), France, Apr. 2, 1507. His parents dedicated him at an early age to St. Francis of Assisi, to whose intercession they attributed his birth. At the age of twelve he entered the Franciscan monastery of San Marco in Calabria, and quickly surpassed the strictest monks in his rigid observance of the rule. After spending a year as novice, he accompanied his parents in a pilgrimage to Assisi, Rome and other holy places, and after his return to Paola lived for six years in a cave on the seashore, gradually gathering about him a band of disciples. After a few years the archbishop of Cosenza gave permission for the erection

of a monastery and church, probably about 1454, although the date is usually given as 1435. This marks the establishment of his order, which assumed the title of "Eremites of St. Francis" and strove to surpass the Franciscans by a more rigid application of the vow of poverty and by extreme asceticism. The fame of the miracles of St. Francis soon attracted the attention of Paul II. who sent a chamberlain in 1469 to test them. The result was favorable, and the rule of the new order was confirmed by Sixtus IV. in a bull issued May 23, 1474, their founder himself being appointed corrector-general. The rule was slightly modified by Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., and Julius II., the second changing the name of the order to *Minimi fratres* ("Least of the Brethren"), probably in allusion to Matt. xxv. 40. Numerous miracles are recounted of St. Francis, many of them closely resembling those of Christ. As a consequence, Louis XI. of France, when near death, summoned him to his court, but was obeyed only at the command of the pope, St. Francis declining to attempt to prolong the dying monarch's life by his prayers. The new king, Charles VIII., induced him to remain in France, consulted him both in spiritual and secular matters, and built for him two monasteries in France, one at Plessis-les-Tours and the other at Amboise, as well as a third at Rome, to be occupied solely by French monks. Francis was canonized by Leo X. in 1519.

The Minims are bound, in addition to the three monastic vows, by a fourth which devotes them to a *vita quadrigesimalis*, or perpetual fast, enjoining abstinence from all meat and lacticinia, and permitting only bread and water, oil, vegetables, and fruit to be used for food. The appointed fasts of the Church are intensified by the Minims, who are also bound by strict rules of silence. The rule of the Minimite nuns, whose first convent was established at Andujar in Spain in 1495, closely resembles that for the monks, but the Tertiaries of both sexes are subject to far less rigid restrictions, especially with regard to diet. During its period of greatest prosperity, from the death of its founder to the end of the sixteenth century, the order had 450 houses, and extended its missionary activity as far as India. It now has only nineteen cloisters, the mother house at Paola, Sant'Andrea della Fratte in Rome, fourteen in Sicily, and one each in Naples, Marseilles, and Cracow. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: The earliest life of the founder is in *ASB*, April, i. 105–234. Other lives are by Hilarion de Coste, Paris, 1655; I. Toscano, Venice, 1704; C. du Vivier, Douai, 1722; Rolland, Paris, 1874; J. Dabert, Paris, 1877; and in *KL*, iv. 1824–26.

Early accounts of the order are: L. de Montoia, *Cronica general de la orden de los Minimos*, Madrid, 1619; Louis Doni Datichi, *Hist. générale de l'ordre des Minimes*, Paris, 1624; F. Lanovius, *Chronicon generale ordinis Minimorum*, ib. 1635. Consult: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, vii. 426–452; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 527 sqq.; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 268–270. On the Rules consult: C. Passarelli, *Statuta fratrum Minorum*, Naples, 1570; *Les Règles des frères et sœurs et des fidèles . . . de l'ordre des Minimes*, Paris, 1632; *Digestum sapientiæ Minimitanæ tripartitum*, ed. P. Baltas d'Avila, Lille, 1667; *Traduction nouvelle des règles de l'ordre des Minimes*, Paris, 1703.

FRANCIS OF PARIS. See Jansen, Cornelius, Jansenism, § 7.

FRANCIS, SAINT, OF SALES: Saint Francis of Sales, noted preacher and devotional author; born at the château of Sales near Annecy (25 m. s. of Geneva) in Savoy, Aug. 21, 1567; d. at Lyons Dec. 28, 1622. He was a member of a noble family of Savoy and at the age of twelve entered the Jesuit college in Paris, where he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, the classics and Hebrew, leading at the same time a life of stern asceticism in fulfilment of an early vow to the Virgin. From 1584 to 1590 he studied civil and canon law at Padua, but gave himself up more and more to theology under the guidance of the Jesuit Possevin. During a severe illness he determined to enter the priesthood, and carried out his purpose in 1591, in spite of the opposition of his family.

Placed under the authority of the bishop of Geneva, who was then residing at Annecy, Francis began to play an important part in the movement for bringing back to the Roman faith the inhabitants of the province of Chablais and of the district of Gex, lying on the Lake of Geneva. Conquered in 1536 by the Bernese and converted to Protestantism, Chablais and Gex were restored to Philibert Emmanuel of Savoy by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1564 with the assurance of religious freedom. This pledge, faithfully kept by Philibert, was broken by his son Charles Emmanuel, who succeeded in 1580, and discerned in the close connection prevailing between the people of the two regions and the inhabitants of Bern and Geneva a menace to his political authority. Peaceful methods were at first decided upon, and to Francis of Sales the mission was confided. In spite of his zeal, courage, patience and remarkable gifts of persuasion, Francis met with absolute failure at Thonon, the capital of Chablais, whose inhabitants entered into a compact to refuse even a hearing to the eloquent preacher. Only among the peasantry and the nobility could he point to a few isolated conversions. Convinced that nothing was to be accomplished by peaceful means, he abandoned the field of his labors in the winter of 1596–97, and at Turin in the ducal council declared himself for a policy of forcible conversion, calling for the expulsion of the Protestant clergy, the prohibition of Evangelical literature, the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic parishes, the foundation of a Jesuit college, and the restoration of the mass in the city of Thonon. The plan was adopted, priests and monks were sent into the country, soldiers were quartered upon the inhabitants; and with the additional weapon of exile the Roman reaction was speedily triumphant. Encouraged by their success, the authorities turned their eyes to Geneva whither Francis went in 1597 at the instance of Pope Clement VIII. There he came into repeated contact with the aged Beza, and, convinced that the great Huguenot could not be gained over by argument, attempted bribery—an act which roused Beza to great indignation. To his very last day Francis retained an irreconcilable hatred for Geneva, which he designated as the home of the devil and of heretics.

Activity in Chablais, Gex, and Geneva.

In 1602, on the death of the bishop of Geneva, Francis succeeded to the see, of which he had for some time been coadjutor. In the performance of the duties of his office he lived up to the very highest standard of pastoral obligation. His fame as a preacher caused him to be summoned repeatedly to France, where he enjoyed great influence. With the aid of Madame de Chantal he founded in 1604 the order of the Visitation (see VISITATION, ORDER OF THE) devoted to the care of the sick and later also to the education of the young.

Bishop of Geneva.

In 1618 Francis composed his *Introduction à la vie dévote*, one of the most popular books among Roman Catholics to the present day, the object of which, as he explained in his preface, was to meet the pious needs of those whose calling lay in the spheres of active life. The book is in the form of a discourse addressed to a certain Philothea, and treats in five chapters of repentance, prayer, the various virtues, temptations, and pious practises. "The world," he says, "often looks with contempt upon piety because it pictures the pious as men of downcast and sorrowful faces, but Christ himself testifies that the inner life is a soft, sweet, and happy one." In his indulgence to the demands made by the world he often goes to extremes. His views find their systematic expression in his *Traité de l'amour de Dieu*. Proceeding from the principle that the will, appointed by the Lord as ruler of all the powers of the soul, finds its highest expression in the love of God, he finds two principal manifestations of this love, one passive, revealing itself in attraction toward the divine, and one active, finding expression in the performance of the will of God. The first consists primarily in prayer, by which is understood not merely verbal utterance of devotion but the inner approach of the soul toward God. The inner form of prayer is of two degrees, the lower, meditation, the higher, contemplation. Its highest degree is the total absorption of the soul into its God, ecstasy. In Francis we find an undisguised exposition of the doctrines of Quietism. As a counterpoise to the evil consequences that might possibly follow on the extreme interpretation of his mystic doctrine, Francis sets up the active love of God, which consists in the fulfilment of the divine will. In three books he gives a detailed account of the various virtues in which this active love manifests itself, a love which in Francis himself revealed itself throughout his life. He was canonized in 1665, and in 1878 was declared a doctor of the universal Church. (J. EHNI†.)

His Works and Doctrine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Œuvres* of St. Francis appeared 16 vols., Paris, 1821; 8 vols., Lyons, 1868; ed. H. B. Mackey, Annecy, 1890–97; also an ed., Paris, 1908; *Œuvres choisies*, ed. M. Pagès, 3 vols., Paris, 1890; *Selection from Spiritual Letters*, by H. L. S. Lear, London, 1892; a selection in Fr. by F. Pracht, Paris, 1893. Several of his works are constantly reproduced in English, e. g., *Practical Piety*, London, 1851; *Spiritual Letters* (or selections from them), ib., 1871; *Spiritual Conferences*, ib., 1862; *Introduction to a Devout Life*, Oxford, 1875. For his life or phases of it consult: Baroness Herbert of Lea, *Mission of St Francis in the Chablais*, London, 1868; J. P. Camus, *The Spirit of Francis of Sales*, ib., 1880; A. Peraté, *La Mission de François de Sales dans le Chablais*, Rome, 1886; G. Porter, *The Heart of St. Francis*, London, 1887; J. F. Gouthier, *La Mission de S. François de Sales dans . Chablais*, Annecy, 1891; H. B. Mackey, *St. Francis de Sales as a Preacher*, London, 1898; F. Strowski, *S. François de Sales*, Paris, 1898; A. Delplanque, *S. François de Sales, humaniste et écrivain latin*, Lille, 1908; Marsollier, *Vie de S. François de Sales*, Tours, 1908; R. Ornsby, *Life of St. Francis de Sales*, London, n.d.; *KL*, iv. 1826–36.

FRANCIS XAVIER, SAINT: The founder and pioneer of modern Roman Catholic missions to the heathen; b. at the castle of Xavier, near Pamplona (195 m. n.n.e. of Madrid), in Navarre, Apr. 7, 1506; d. on the island of San-chan (Chang-Chuang, St. John's Island, on the south coast of China, 125 m. s. of Canton) Dec. 2, 1552. He sprang from an aristocratic family of Navarre. While preparing himself for the higher spiritual career at the University of Paris, he became acquainted with Ignatius Loyola, soon stood completely under his influence, and was one of those who on Aug. 15, 1534, bound themselves by a vow at Montmartre and formed the nucleus of the subsequent Society of Jesus (see IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA). The field of labor falling to Francis Xavier was that of missions to the heathen. As King John III. of Portugal desired Jesuit missionaries for the East Indies, he was ordered thither, leaving Lisbon on Apr. 7, 1541; from August of that year till Mar. 1542, he remained in Mozambique, and reached Goa, the capital of the Portuguese colonies, on May 6. His first missionary activity was among the Paravas, pearl-fishers along the southerly portion of the east coast of Hindustan. He then exerted himself to win the king of Travancore to Christianity, on the west coast, and also visited Ceylon. Dissatisfied with the results of his activity, he turned eastward in 1545, and planned a missionary journey to Macassar, on the island of Celebes. Having arrived in Malacca in October of that year and waited there three months in vain for a ship to Macassar, he gave up the goal of his voyage, and went to Amboyna and other of the Molucca Islands, returning to India in Jan., 1548. The next fifteen months were occupied with various journeys and administrative measures in India. Then his displeasure by reason of the unchristian life and manners of the Portuguese, whereby his proselyting work was seriously impeded, drove him forth once again into the unknown Far East. He left Goa on Apr. 15, 1549, stopped at Malacca, visited Canton, and on Aug. 15 reached Japan, where he landed at Kagoshima, the principal port of the province of Satsuma, on the island of Kiushiu. He was received in friendly manner and was permitted to preach, but, not knowing the native language, had to limit himself to reading aloud the translation of a catechism. For all this, his sojourn was not without fruits, as is attested by congregations established in Hiudo, Samaguchi, and Bungo (see JAPAN, III., 1, § 1). After more than two years in Japan, he returned to India, and was back in Goa by Jan., 1552. In April he was again under way, aiming for China, but died on the journey.

Francis Xavier accomplished a great missionary work both as organizer and as pioneer. By his compromises in India with the Christians of St. Thomas he developed the Jesuit missionary methods

along lines that subsequently became fateful for his order (see JESUITS; ACCOMMODATION, § 8); the instruction he dispensed in connection with baptism was superficial; and he combined missions with politics, and approved of the extension of Christianity by force (cf. his letter to King John III. of Portugal, Cochin, Jan. 20, 1548). Yet he had high qualifications as missionary; he was animated with glowing zeal, the consciousness of acting in God's service never forsook him, he was endowed with great linguistic gifts, and his activity was marked by restless pushing forward. His efforts left a significant impression upon the missionary history of India; and by pointing out the way to East India to the Jesuits, his work is of fundamental significance with regard to the history of the propagation of Christianity in China and Japan. The results of his labor that he himself witnessed were not slight (mere figures may be disregarded, as they are difficult to verify); but still greater were the tasks he proposed. And since the Roman Catholic Church responded to his call, the effects of his efforts reach far beyond the Jesuit order; the entire systematic and aggressive incorporation of great masses of people on broad lines of policy by the Roman Catholic Church in modern times, dates back to Francis Xavier. He was beatified by Paul V on Oct. 25, 1619, and was canonized by Gregory XV. on Mar. 12, 1622.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best sources for a life are the letters, 146 in all, translated into Latin by R. Minchaca, with the title *S. Francisci Xaverii epistolarum omnium libri quattuor*, Bologna, 1795; next is the *Monumenta Xaveriana*, in the *Monumenta historica societatis Jesu*, Madrid, 1899. Consult: H. F. Coleridge, *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, 2 vols., New York, 1886; Mary H. MacClean, *Life of Francis Xavier*, London, 1895; H. Haas, *Geschichte des Christentums in Japan*, 2 vols., Tokyo, 1902–04; L. J. M. Cros, *S. François de Xavier*, Paris, 1903; *KL.* iv. 1839–43. A really critical life is still a desideratum.

FRANCISCANS. See FRANCIS, SAINT, OF ASSISI, AND THE FRANCISCAN ORDER.

FRANCISCUS A SANCTA CLARA. See DAVENPORT, CHRISTOPHER.

FRANCK, frănk **(FRANK), JOHANN:** German lyric poet; b. at Guben (79 m. s.e. of Berlin), Brandenburg, June 1, 1618; d. there June 18, 1677. He studied law at Königsberg, was a councilor in his native town, later on mayor and a member of the county council of the Niederlausitz. Under the influence of the Silesian School and of Simon Dach of Königsberg he produced a series of poems and hymns, collected and edited by himself in two volumes (Guben, 1674), entitled: *Teutsche Gedichte, enthaltend geistliches Zion samt Vaterunserharfe nebst irdischem Helicon oder Lob-, Lieb-, Leidgedichte*, etc. His secular poems are forgotten; about forty of his religious songs, hymns, and psalms have been kept in the hymn-books of the German Protestant Church. Some of these are the hymn for the Holy Communion "Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele" ("Deck thyself, my soul, with gladness"); the Advent hymn "Komm, Heidenheiland, Lösegeld" ("Come, Ransom of our captive race;" a translation into German of J. Campanus's "Veni Redemptor gentium"); a hymn to Christ, "Jesu, meine Freude" ("Jesus, my chief pleasure"). The music for his hymns by the Guben organist Christoph Peter appeared first in the *Andachtscymbeln*, the oldest Guben hymn-book, in 1648. In honor of Johann Franck a simple monument has been erected at the south wall of the Guben parish-church.

A. WERNER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Jentsch, *Johann Franck von Guben*, Guben, 1877. On his hymns consult A. Knapp, *Evangelischer Lieder-Schatz*, ii. 849 Stuttgart, 1850; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 386–387.

FRANCK (FRANK), SEBASTIAN.

His Peculiar Views (§ 1). The Chronica (§ 3).
His Literary Activity (§ 2). Other Works (§ 4).

Sebastian Franck, one of the popular writers of the Reformation, was born at Donauwörth (25 m. n. of Augsburg) 1499; d. Basel (?) 1542 or 1543. He entered the University of Ingolstadt in 1515, and continued his studies at Bethlehem college, an institution of the Dominicans at Heidelberg, incorporated in the university. Here he met his later opponents, Martin Frecht and Butzer. Bethlehem was still dominated by the scholasticism of the closing Middle Ages, but influences of humanism also made themselves felt. Subsequently Franck became priest in the bishopric of Augsburg, and in 1527 he occupied a clerical position at Gustenfelden, a small borough near Nuremberg.

1. His Peculiar Views.

At this time his standpoint was strictly Lutheran, and he attacked the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists. But in his *Türkenchronik* (1530) his radicalism began to find expression. Here he treats of "ten or eleven nations or sects of Christianity" of which none possesses the full truth, and at the close he intimates that beside the three faiths, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian and the Anabaptist, there would soon arise a fourth, an invisible spiritual Church which would be governed by the eternal invisible word of God without any external means such as ceremonies, sacraments and sermons. Thus Franck appears as the representative of a mystic spiritualism which placed him in strong contrast with ecclesiastical Protestantism. In 1528 he resigned his position at Gustenfelden and went to Nuremberg and in the following year to Strasburg. In the free atmosphere of the two imperial cities his views underwent an entire change—the theologian became a popular writer, the Lutheran an opponent of every Christian system that is bound by ecclesiastical rules. He searched for God's truth among all people, in nature, and history as well as in the Bible. In Strasburg he came into contact with congenial opponents of the ecclesiastical Reformation, especially with Servetus and Hans Bünderlin of Linz. Under the influence of the latter as well as of Schwenckfeld his spiritualism reached its full development. He held that the whole external Church and all its institutions were corrupted by Antichrist immediately after the time of the apostles. It is not God's will, he thought, that it should be reerected, the inner illumination by the spirit of God being sufficient. We must all unlearn what we have learned from the pope, Luther, and Zwingli.

In 1531 there appeared at Strasburg Franck's first great work, *Chronica, Zeitbuch und Geschichtsbibel.* The frank criticisms in the book caused a great sensation, there being no party which had not received its share. Princes became aware of the dangerous character of the book, and prominent men like Erasmus entered their complaints. In 1531 Franck was imprisoned and his chronicle confiscated, but he was soon released and expelled from Strasburg. He went to Esslingen where he established a soap factory for the support of his family. In 1533 he was permitted to settle at Ulm. Here he established a printing-press and printed some of his works which again brought him into conflict with the theologians and authorities. At the instigation of Martin Frecht, first preacher at Ulm, Franck was ordered in 1535 to leave the city, but he protested against this decision and was allowed to remain. He published several other works which, however, he was not allowed to print at Ulm. They appeared at Frankfort and again offended the theologians. Frecht succeeded in inducing the Town Council to expel Franck from Ulm in 1539. In 1540 a resolution written by Melanchthon was passed at the convention of theologians in Schmalkalden in which Franck was accused of separation from the Church, contempt for the Bible and the ministry, and of heresy. These experiences naturally increased the bitterness of his criticisms, but did not paralyze his energy. In 1539 he moved with his family and printing-press to Basel where he was active in the production and printing of numerous writings until his death.

2. His Literary Activity.

Franck has left no adherents as he belonged to no party. The ecclesiastical leaders of the time did not understand his independence; they only recognized the incongruity of his ideas with their theology and the contradiction between his abstract idealism and their newly established Church. He was severely attacked by Luther, who criticized him for his pessimism and the lack of positive Christian thought in his works; the other Protestant theologians judged similarly. But in spite of all damnatory criticisms by theologians Franck's productions were circulated in numerous editions and remained popular for more than a century. Even more lasting and greater was their influence upon the development of free thought in the Netherlands. Franck was no original thinker in the higher sense. Most of his thoughts on spiritualism were borrowed from the older philosophic mysticism, and he had too little of a religious nature to mark an epoch in the history of mysticism. While his works are superficial and betray a lack of erudition, they are full of a glowing patriotism and pointed remarks and criticisms on the shortcomings of his people and his time. Franck's *Chronica* consists of three parts; the first comprises the time from Adam to Christ, the second treats of emperors and secular affairs, the third of popes and spiritual affairs. The larger part of the material has been taken from other works, but the book is original in its arrangement, in its leading ideas, in its criticisms of ecclesiastical phenomena of the past and present and of the political and social conditions of the people; it became very popular, and many later works of a similar kind were dependent upon it. Apart from the information on contemporaneous history and customs, the chief value of the book lies in the *Ketzerchronik* of the third part. Here Franck has compiled all the different beliefs which according to the judgment of Romanism would have to be considered heretical if it were consistent. Among the reformers appear the Anabaptists and enthusiasts; among the heretics rejected by the Church such as Marcion, Arius, Huss and Wyclif are found the great pillars of the Church—Augustine, Ambrose, etc.—in so far as they taught differently from the sixteenth-century Roman Church; by the side of the prophets of the Old Testament appear the sibyls, philosophers, and poets of the pagans—everything in alphabetical order with epitomes of their writings and pervaded by a delicate irony. Franck's purpose was to show the vain presumption of Rome and of all other sects in their claims to possess the only right faith. He criticizes severely the violence of princes and the nobility, but not less the stupidity of the mob in changing its faith like a garment, and the arrogance of the learned. He demands a decisive reform in State and society, being conscious of the misery and disorder of social and ecclesiastical conditions. The *Weltbuch, Cosmographie* (Tübingen, 1534) appeared as the fourth part of the executive work.

3. The Chronica.

Franck printed his *Paradoxa, 280 Wunderreden* at Ulm in 1534, and calls it the true and divine philosophy and theology for all Christians. Here he developed, on the basis of Dionysius the Areopagite, Eckhart, Tauler and the *Deutsche Theologie*, his mystical and speculative theories on the relation between God and the world, God and sin, liberty and necessity, spirit and flesh, Christ and Antichrist. Subsequently there appeared his *Germaniæ Chronicon* (Frankfort, 1538) and *Die güldene Arch* (Augsburg, 1538). In the latter work he placed side by side passages from Holy Scripture, from the Church Fathers, and from illuminated pagans. By the side of Augustine is placed Hermes Trismegistus; by the side of Thomas, Orpheus; by the side of Plato, Tauler. Franck also translated Erasmus's "Praise of Folly" (1534) to which he appended treatises, one concerning the vanity of all human arts and sciences; the second concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and the third concerning the praise of the "foolish divine word" and the difference between the internal and external word. *Das Kriegsbüchlein des Friedens* (Basel, 1539) was directed against the court preachers who justified war like the princes. *Das verbütschierte Buch* (1539) is a sort of concordance which is arranged in such a way that the contradictions in the letter of Scripture become prominent, and was intended to lead away from the letter to the spirit. Franck also published two collections of proverbs (Frankfort, 1541) which became popular and were enjoyed by Lessing.

5. Other Works.

(A. Hegler†.) K. Holl.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The most important work is A. Hegler, *Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck*, Freiburg, 1892. Consult also: C. T. Keim, *Die Reformation der Reichstadt Ulm*, Stuttgart, 1851; C. A. Hase, *Sebastian Franck, der Schwarmgeist*, Leipsic, 1869; C. Sepp, *Geschiedkundige Nasporingen*, i. 158 sqq., Leyden, 1872 (important); C. Gerbert, *Geschichte der Strassburger Sektenbewegung*, Strasburg, 1889; E. Tausch, *Sebastian Franck und seine Lehrer*, Halle, 1893; *ADB*, vii. 214 sqq.

FRANCKE, AUGUST HERMANN.

Early Life and Studies (§ 1).
His Work in Leipsic, Erfurt, and Halle (§ 2).
His Philanthropic Institutions (§ 3).
His Service to Missions and Pedagogy (§ 4).
His Writings (§ 5).

August Hermann Francke, founder of the charitable institutions at Halle bearing his name, was born at Lübeck Mar. 12, 1663; d. at Halle June 8, 1727. In his third year his father, a jurist, removed to Gotha, on the call of Duke Ernest I. the Pious (q.v.), and died there a few months later. The pious influences of his home determined the son to study theology. He was educated by private tutors and at the gymnasium of Gotha, where he passed his final examination in 1679. After half a year's stay at Erfurt he went to Kiel, where he was influenced by Christian Kortholt (q.v.), a theologian of Spener's tendency. His memoirs illustrating this period show how strict he was in his self-discipline and how eagerly he longed for a perfect Christianity. After three years he went for two months to Hamburg where he perfected his knowledge of Hebrew under Ezra Edzard. Then he returned to Gotha, always dissatisfied with himself as being a mere "natural" man. In 1684 he continued his studies at Leipsic and in 1685 became master of arts, receiving at the same time permission to lecture as privatdocent.

1. Early Life and Studies.

In Leipsic his future Pietistic tendency began to manifest itself by his absorption in Holy Scripture. He helped to found the *Collegium philobiblicum* (see PIETISM) for a closer study of Old and New Testament exegesis. These Bible studies became very popular, and Francke confessed that he grasped the deep truths of Scripture first in these gatherings; but he was still dissatisfied with himself. In 1687 he went to Lüneburg to continue his Biblical studies under the guidance of the learned superintendent Sandhagen. The period at Lüneburg was destined to become the turning-point of his inner life as he dated from this time his conversion. In 1688 he was again at Hamburg, where he continued his exegetical studies under the influence of the learned preacher Johann Winkler, a friend of Spener. Toward the end of the same year he returned to Leipsic, visiting Spener at Dresden for two months on the way. The intimate intercourse with this congenial man exerted a great influence upon Francke, and ever after they were united by a bond of cordial affection, assisting each other in their labors and keeping up their correspondence until 1702.

After Francke's return to Leipsic in Feb., 1689, and the resumption of his earlier academic activity, his influence began to make itself felt in larger circles. By his lectures—which were chiefly exegetical, and attended by so many that the largest auditorium could hardly hold all his hearers—as well as by his sermons and his personal intercourse with the students, he was the originator of a movement which struck deep roots in the minds of his hearers and was destined to effect a deepening of piety by a conscious devotion to Christ in a living, personal faith. It was inevitable that his success should arouse envy, and it must be confessed that not everything in the movement of Francke and his friends was commendable, as, for instance, the contempt of science and distrust of earnest philosophical study united with self-complacency and conceit among those who were only superficially inspired by the Spirit. Francke's chief opponent was his colleague, J. B. Carpzov (q.v.), at whose instigation, the faculty prohibited the continuation of the *Collegia biblica* and instituted a formal investigation against Francke, the result of which was that he had to confine himself to lectures of a philosophical nature. In 1690 he gladly accepted a call to the Church of the Augustinians at Erfurt. Here he developed again in an extraordinary manner his successful activity in the spirit of Pietistic Christianity. Students from Leipsic and Jena followed him to Erfurt, and his influence made itself felt beyond the town. But the opponents of Francke rose again and instituted a commission, the result of which was his dismissal from office (1691). He went to Gotha and from there was invited to Berlin by Spener. Owing to the latter's influence, he received in 1692 a parish at Glaucha, now a suburb of Halle, and at the same time the chair of Greek and Oriental languages in the University of Halle. Here he found among his colleagues a circle of congenial men who followed the tendency of Spener. The opposition of the orthodox town clergy was soon overcome. Francke's parochial activity and pastoral care exercised the deepest and most far-reaching influences. His sermons centered in the great theme of Pietistic theology, sin and grace. They were spontaneous utterances of his innermost being and testimonies from his own experience. His practical activity enlivened his lectures and made his study of the Bible more fruitful for the calling of his students, and his scientific work in its turn had a wholesome effect upon his sermons and religious instruction. He entered into intimate relations with his colleagues J. J. Breithaupt and Paul Anton (qq.v.), who held the same theological convictions, and the three men gave to the newly founded faculty its characteristic stamp of Pietism. The chief factors were a profound study of the Bible, an unfolding of the thoughts of salvation contained in it without the mechanical dogmatics of the orthodox, practical guidance in the successful performance of the clerical office, and insistence upon pious conduct and a godly life. In accordance with Francke's general views his lectures treated first of all Biblical exegesis, but hermeneutics, homiletics, and parenetics were not excluded.

2. His Work in Leipsic, Erfurt, and Halle.

But his chief activity belonged from the beginning to his congregation. His eminent gifts showed

themselves not only in his pastoral care, but also in the field of pedagogy. In both spheres he developed the most strenuous activity, taxing his powers to the utmost. He preached twice on Sunday, conducted daily prayer-meetings and daily catechizations of children, and paid regular visits to the members of his congregation. In 1695 he opened his pauper-school in the parsonage with the aid of a poor student, and this undertaking of Christian charity was the seed from which all the other institutions of Francke developed. The number of children grew rapidly, and soon larger accommodations had to be provided, and the number of teachers had to be increased. In 1696 there originated the *Pädagogium* which was intended chiefly for the education of boys whose parents lived out of town, and almost simultaneously the orphan asylum was established. The teaching staff of these institutions consisted for the most part of poor students, who, in compensation for their services, received free board. In 1697 there was founded the so-called Latin School to prepare boys for academic studies. There was something almost miraculous in the growth and rapid development of these various institutions, and Francke revealed an extraordinary talent of organization in their management. His trust in God awakened everywhere the same spirit, and voluntary contributions poured in from far and near so that he considered his success a direct answer to his fervent prayers. In the year of his death more than 2,200 children were being instructed in his institutions, among them 134 orphans; 175 teachers and eight inspectors were employed; and about 250 students received free board. There were also added a printing-press and publishing establishment and a pharmacy which contributed a large profit to the institutions.

3. His Philanthropic Institutions.

Not less important was Francke's interest in foreign missions. The orphanage with its numerous assistants and teachers became for a time an important center for the education of missionaries for India. Ziegenbalg, Plütschau, and C. F. Schwarz were trained in Francke's institutions and, together with the Moravians, deserve the credit of having inaugurated the missionary history of modern times for Germany. Another undertaking due to the influence of Francke is the Bible Institute founded in 1710 by Baron von Canstein (q.v.), a faithful admirer of Francke. Francke also rendered great services to the cause of pedagogy. As he was free from the restrictions by the authorities, he was able to realize some of his innermost ideals. The main purpose of education was for him to lead children to a saving knowledge of God and Christ and to true Christianity. Without true love to God and man all knowledge appeared to him worthless, and he considered it the task of the higher as well as of the lower schools to further not only Christian instruction, but Christian life. He hated all empty formalism and tried in every way to introduce object-lessons, and to emphasize instruction for the practical matters of life.

4. His Service to Missions and Pedagogy.

Francke's writings were numerous, but relatively unimportant. His *Pädagogische Schriften* have been edited by G. Kramer, with an account of his life and institutions, as vol. xi. of the *Bibliothek pädeagogisher Klassiker* (2d ed., Langensalza, 1885). His *Fussstapfen des noch lebenden Gottes*, an account of his institutions (Halle, 1701, and many later editions), was translated into English (*An Abstract of the Marvellous Footsteps of Divine Providence*, London, 1706 and often). Other English translations which were highly popular in their time are *Nicodemus or a treatise against the fear of man* (London, 1706); *A Letter to a Friend concerning the Most Useful Way of Preaching* (1754); *Faith in Christ inconsistent with a Solicitous Concern about the Things of this World, a sermon* (1759); *A Guide to the Reading and Study of the Holy Scripture* (1813).

5. His Writings.

(T. FÖRSTER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Kramer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte A. H. Francke's, Briefwechsel Francke's und Spener's*, Halle, 1861; idem, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte Francke's*, ib. 1875; idem, *August Hermann Francke. Ein Lebensbild*, 2 vols., Halle, 1880–82 (the best, some mistakes in which are corrected in W. Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichsuniversität in Halle*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1894); T. Förster, *August Hermann Francke. Ein Lebensbild*, Halle, 1898. Consult also, A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, vol. ii., Bonn, 1884; J. Jüngst-Stettin, *Pietisten*, pp. 24–38, Tübingen, 1906.

FRANK, FRANZ HERMANN REINHOLD VON: German Lutheran; b. at Altenburg (26 m. s. of Leipsic) Mar. 25, 1827; d. at Erlangen Feb. 7, 1894. His early life was spent at Zschernitz, and in 1839 he entered the gymnasium of Altenburg, matriculating in 1845 at the University of Leipsic to study theology, philosophy and philology (Ph.D., 1850; licentiate of theology, 1851). There, under the influence of Harless, Frank underwent an entire change of views, and from a rationalist he became an enthusiastic admirer of the Lutheran confession and of early Protestant theology. In 1851 he became subrector of a school at Ratzeburg, and two years later teacher of religion in the gymnasium of Altenburg. In 1857 he was appointed extraordinary professor of church history and systematic theology in Erlangen, and in the following year became ordinary professor; while from 1875 until his death he occupied the chair of systematic theology.

Early Life.

Not only as a theological leader, but also as a moral character, Frank exercised a far-reaching influence. He was thoroughly convinced of the truth of his conservative ideas; but deeply rooted as he was in Evangelical principles, he still maintained a deep interest in modern life with its aims and problems, while he was opposed to reactionary tendencies in ecclesiastical affairs, and to external authority in political relations. He may be styled the dogmatician of the "Erlangen theology." Twice his views were essentially changed—in Leipsic he was won for the old truth, in Erlangen, under the influence of Hofmann, for the "new mode of teaching the old truth."

Frank's most characteristic work was his *System der christlichen Gewissheit* (2 vols., Erlangen,

1870–73; 2d ed., 1881–83; Eng. transl. by M. J. Evans, "System of Christian Certainty," Edinburgh, 1886). The great question which Frank attempted to answer in this work was the basis of belief. The answer is offered by the positive assurance of the Christian. The Christian is transposed into a new state of life, and into a state of regeneration and conversion of which he becomes positively assured. This assurance, however, implies also the assurance of an objective cause. Thus there result three groups of objects of Christian assurance; the immanent objects as the effects of the objective cause inherent in the subject (knowledge of sin; reality of the new life); the transcendent objects (God as the supramundane factor, the Trinity; the atoning God-Man); and the transmittent objects (the Word, the Sacraments, the Church), or the historical and concrete media by which faith experiences the effect of the supramundane cause. Each of these three groups is opposed by a development of modern intellectualism; so that rationalism denies the reality of the peculiar religious experience of the Christian; pantheism does away with the causality of a personal God; and criticism (as represented by Baur and Strauss) tries to prove the Church and church life to be merely natural phenomena devoid of any specifically inherent transcendent causality. According to Frank, the objects of faith are implied in the assertion of the Ego of the new man, and he is assured of them according to the degree of the certainty of that Ego concerning itself.

Theory of Christian Certitude.

Having thus acquired the realities of Christian faith, it is the task of dogmatics, as set forth by Frank in his *System der christlichen Wahrheit* (2 vols., Erlangen, 1878–80; 3d ed., 1893–94), to grasp and represent the objects of Christian faith in their inner connection. Here Frank no longer starts from subjective assurance, but from the first cause of Christian realities, from the *principium essendi*, or God. His work accordingly represents the evolution of the humanity of God. The first part treats of the "principle of evolution" and establishes the doctrine of God. The second part is devoted to the "realization of evolution" in three divisions: generation (creation, world, man), degeneration (sin, devil), and regeneration, the latter comprising the humanity of God as being realized for the God-Man; the humanity of God as posited in the God-Man; and the humanity of God as evolving from the God-Man, that is (*a*) the humanity of God as the object of becoming (the means of grace); (*b*) the humanity of God as the subject of becoming (the order of salvation); and (*c*) the humanity of God as the object-subject of becoming (the Church). The third part describes the "aim of becoming," or eschatology.

Dogmatic System.

The life-work of Frank as a systematic theologian found its completion in his *System der christlichen Sittlichkeit* (2 vols., Erlangen, 1884–87; Eng. transl., *System of the Christian Certainty*, Edinburgh, 1886.) The leading point of view in this work is the "evolution of the God-Man." Frank attacked the theology of Ritschl in his *Ueber die kirchliche Bedeutung der Theologie A. Ritschls* (Leipsic, 1888) and *Zur Theologie A. Ritschls* (3d. ed., 1891); and he also wrote *Evangelische Schulreden* (Altenburg, 1856); *Die Theologie der Concordienformel* (4 vols., Erlangen, 1858–65); *Aus dem Leben christlicher Frauen* (Gütersloh, 1873); *Dogmatische Studien* (Leipsic, 1892); *Vademecum für angehende Theologen* (1892); and *Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie* (1894; 3d ed., 1898). (R. SEEBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Seeberg, *F. H. R. von Frank; ein Gedenkblatt*, Leipsic, 1894; J. Gottschick, *Die Kirchlichkeit der sogenannten kirchlichen Theologie*, pp. 110 sqq., Freiburg, 1890; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, iii., part 1, pp. 495 sqq., Berlin, 1890; O. Pfleiderer, *Die Entwicklung der protestantischen Theologie seit Kant*, pp. 183 sqq., Freiburg, 1891; G. Daxer, *Der Subjektivismus in Franks "System der christlichen Gewissheit"* Gütersloh, 1900; F. K. E. Weber, *F. H. R. von Franks Gotteslehre*, Leipsic, 1901.

FRANK, GUSTAV WILHELM: German Protestant; b. at Schleiz (24 m. s.w. of Gara) Sept. 25, 1832; d. at Vienna Sept. 24, 1904. He studied at Jena, where he became privat-docent in 1859 and was appointed associate professor of theology in 1864. In 1867 he was called to Vienna as full professor of dogmatic and symbolic theology, and the same year became a member of the Evangelical ecclesiastical council in Vienna. He edited E. F. Apelt's *Religionsphilosophie* (Leipsic, 1860), and wrote *Memorabilia quædam Flaciana* (Schleiz, 1856); *De Luthero rationalismi præcursore* (Leipsic, 1857); *De Academia Jenensi evangelicæ veritatis altrice* (Schleiz, 1858); *Die jenaische Theologie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung* (Leipsic, 1858); *De Matthiæ Flacii Illyrici in libros sacros meritis* (1859); *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie* (vols. i.–iii., 1862–75, vol. iv., with *Lebensabriss* by G. Lösche, 1905); *Johann Major, der Wittenberger Poet* (Halle, 1863); *Das Toleranzpatent Kaiser Joseph II* (Vienna, 1882); and *Symbolæ ad recentiorem C. R. ordinis Theologorum evangelicorum Vindobonensis historiam congestæ* (1896).

FRANK, JACOB (Jankiev Lebowicz): Jewish adventurer, founder of the sect of Frankists; b. in Podolia c.1720; d. at Offenbach (4 m. e. of Frankfort) Dec. 10, 1791. He was the son of a rabbi and originally a distiller, but afterward traveled as a merchant in Turkey, where he received the surname of Frank, the usual designation for Occidentals among the Turks. In Turkey he lived chiefly in Salonica and Smyrna, the centers of Shabbethaianism, and himself became a prominent member of the sect of Shabbethai Zebi. On his return to Poland he became famous as a cabalist. In 1755 he settled in Podolia, gathered about him a group of local sectaries and began to preach to them a new gospel. The essence of his teaching seems to have been a negation of moral and religious laws, his mission, in his own words, being "to free the world from the laws and regulations which have hitherto existed." When it leaked out that at his meetings orgies were celebrated similar to those of the Adamites (q.v.), the Roman Catholics joined the orthodox Jews in the suppression of the Frankist sect. At the rabbinical court held at Sovanta

many of the sectaries told of immorality practised under the guise of religious symbolism. As Frank was a Turkish subject he was allowed to leave the country, but many of his followers were imprisoned, and a congress of rabbis at Brody proclaimed excommunication against all the impenitent heretics. Acting on the advice of Frank, his followers, as being anti-Talmudists, now enlisted the sympathies of the Roman Catholics. They claimed to find in the Zohar (see CABALA), which they substituted for the Talmud, the doctrine of the Trinity, and expressed their belief in the Messiah, but without saying that they meant Shabbethai Zebi. The bishop of Kamenetz took up their cause, freed those who were in prison, and compelled the Talmudists to pay a fine to their opponents and deliver up all copies of the Talmud, which were then publicly burned at Kamenetz.

To escape the persecution to which they were again subjected after the death of their patron, the bishop, the Frankists joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1759, Augustus III. of Poland acting as godfather to Frank. The insincerity of the Frankists, however, soon became apparent, and early in the following year Frank was arrested, convicted as a teacher of heresy, and imprisoned in the fortress at Czenstochova. He was liberated by the Russians in 1773 and then became a secret agent of the Russian government. Frank's imprisonment only increased his influence, and the contributions of his numerous followers, together with the large sums received from the Russian court, now enabled him to live in princely splendor. He resided successively at Brünn, Vienna, and Offenbach, whither he repaired in 1788, when his hypocrisy had brought him into disfavor at the Austrian court. To his followers he pretended to be the Messiah, and they thought their "holy master" immortal. On his death his daughter Eve succeeded him as the "holy mistress." The contributions now fell off, and Eve died in obscurity in 1816. The Frankists still survive in Poland, Moldavia, and Turkey. They are nominally Roman Catholics, but maintain their Jewish nationality by marrying only among themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Grätz, *Frank und die Frankisten*, Breslau, 1866; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta Poloniæ . . . ex tabulariis vaticanis collectis*, iv., Rome, 1860; *JE*, v. 475–478 (where the titles of the literature in Polish are given).

FRANKENBERG, JOHANN HEINRICH, COUNT OF: German cardinal; b. at Gross Glogau (35 m. n.n.w. of Liegnitz), Silesia, Sept. 18, 1726; d. at Breda (24 m. w.s.w. of Bois-le-Duc), Holland, June 11, 1804. He was educated at the Jesuit college of his native town, at the University of Breslau, and at the German-Hungarian college in Rome and upon his return to Germany, became coadjutor to the apostolic vicar and archbishop of Görz. On Jan. 27, 1769 Maria Theresa appointed him archbishop of Mechlin and member of the Belgian council of state, and in 1778 Pius VI. invested him with the dignity of a cardinal. When Joseph II. abolished the episcopal seminaries in 1786 and founded state seminaries at Louvain and Luxemburg in their stead Frankenberg was the first to voice the dissatisfaction of the clergy. The emperor, however, further enacted that only those who had completed a five years' course at one of these institutions were eligible for major orders, whereupon the cardinal vainly renewed his objections, maintaining that the new seminary was instituted solely for the propagation of Jansenism. The dissatisfaction of the pupils, however, resulted in open antagonism to the seminary, and the institution was practically disorganized. Frankenberg, who was suspected of being the instigator of their unrest, was summoned to Vienna to give an account of his actions. and was kept in confinement for a time; but the turbulence in Belgium increased, and he was finally set free, being hailed as a martyr upon his return. He continued his protests against the general seminary, and restored his archiepiscopal institution of learning; but an order was issued forbidding him to teach theology under penalty of a fine of 1,000 thalers. He declared this order invalid, and was thereupon directed to go to Louvain, inspect the general seminary and give an account of his objections against it. He obeyed the order, and on June 26, 1789, framed an opinion in which he declared the professors, the text-books, and the method of instruction unorthodox and Jansenistic. This decision was published and used as a means of agitation. Frankenberg was then accused by the imperial minister Count Trautmannsdorf of having incited the people, but he responded that he had acted only as a true shepherd of the faith, and petitioned the emperor to restore to the Church its privilege of educating the clergy as well as the youth of the land. The disturbances in Belgium at length assumed the character of an uprising, and Frankenberg was accused of being its leading spirit. The minister charged him with conspiracy and ordered him to return his various insignia of honor, whereupon the cardinal appealed to the emperor, but Joseph died before the letter reached him. When the French Revolutionists invaded Belgium, Frankenberg bravely resisted them, and was accordingly sentenced by the Convention to deportation, dying a fugitive. (K. KLÜPFEL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Theiner, *Der Cardinal J. H. Graf von Frankenberg*, Freiburg, 1850; *KL*, iv. 1699–1702.

FRANKENTHAL COLLOQUY: A conference between representatives of the Reformed Church of the Palatinate and Anabaptists, held at Frankenthal (20 m. n. by w. of Speyer) May 28–June 19, 1571. There were Anabaptists in the Palatinate from 1525, both native and immigrants. They had settled in great numbers along the Hardt River after they had been cured of the wild fanaticism of the earlier time. As they were industrious cultivators of the soil, Elector Ottheinrich did not dislike them. Hoping to win them over to the Church of the Palatinate, he ordered a colloquy to be held at Pfeddersheim in 1557. No agreement was reached, but the Anabaptists were still tolerated under the condition that they should keep aloof from disturbances and innovations. As some of their teachers from Moravia tried to incite them against the Reformed, Elector Frederic III. the Pious called the colloquy at Frankenthal. It was opened in the presence of the Elector by Chancellor

Christoph Ehem, who had been joined by the Electoral delegates, Wenzelaus Zuleger, Hans Rechklau, and Otto von Hövel. On the side of the Reformed seven prominent preachers were called to the conference, most of them Netherlanders who had entered the service of the Palatine Church or who were preachers of foreign congregations—court preacher Petrus Dathenus, Gerhard Verstegus, Petrus Colonius, Franz Mosellanus, Engelhert Faber, Konrad Eubulæus and Georg Gebinger. Prominent Anabaptists were Diebald Winter, Rauff Bisch, Hans Rannich, and Hans Büchel. Thirteen important points of doctrine in which the Anabaptists deviated from the Reformed were discussed—the authority of the Old Testament, the Trinity, the substance of the body of Christ, original sin, good works, the resurrection of the body, the relation of the Christian to the secular authority, to the sword, and to the oath, and others; finally the baptism of children. The chief speaker of the Reformed was Dathenus, while Rauff Bisch was the most efficient defender of the Anabaptist cause. The Anabaptists showed great haughtiness and stubbornness, refusing to acknowledge in some points the authority of even such Anabaptists as Menno Simons, Jakob Hutter, and Matthæus Cervas. They rejected a thorough theological investigation as a quibble of words. Thus an agreement was impossible, but the two bodies departed without hostility, after a comprehensive protocol had been examined and signed on both sides. The Elector was not satisfied with the result, but decided not to expel the Anabaptists; their leaders, however, were strictly forbidden to teach or baptize in his country. (F. W Cuno†.)

Bibliography: The proceedings (*Protokoll*) were printed, Heidelberg, 1571, by Johann Mayer. Consult: B. G. Struve, *Bericht von der pfälzischen Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 238 sqq., Frankfort, 1721; H. Alting, *Historia ecclesiæ Palatinæ*, Groningen, 1728; F. W Cuno, *Blätter der Erinnerung an Dr. K. Olevianus*, pp. 37–38, Barmen, 1887.

FRANKFORT RECESS (or **AGREEMENT**; called also Frankfort Book, *Formula pacis Francofordianæ*): A document signed Mar. 18, 1558, aiming to compose the disputes between the strictly orthodox Lutherans with Matthias Flacius (q.v.) as their leader and the Philippists (q. v.) who adhered to Melanchthon. The gulf between the two parties had been widened by personal quarrels between the two Saxon lines, the Ernestine line as protector of Flacius and the Albertine line as protector of Melanchthon, also by the rivalry of the University of Wittenberg and the newly founded University of Jena, which took side with Flacius. The Evangelical estates tried to settle the conflict by appointing a convention at Frankfort in June 1557, but it did not come about. The Consultation of Worms (Aug.–Dec. 1557; see Worms) proved ineffectual since the princes did not appear. When Ferdinand I. was proclaimed emperor in Frankfort in Mar., 1558, the Electors Ottheinrich of the Palatinate, August of Saxony and Joachim II. of Brandenburg induced Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, Duke Christopher of Württemberg, and Landgrave Philip of Hesse, to take a personal part in consultations over the settlement of the disputes. The negotiations took place on the basis of a recommendation of Melanchthon, which was approved and made the basis of an agreement signed by the abovementioned estates. The introduction of the recess attempts to refute the reproaches of the Roman Catholics that the Evangelicals disagreed among themselves. It was stated that they did not intend to set up a new confession, but rather to adhere to the pure doctrine as laid down in the Bible, the three principal creeds, and the Augsburg Confession with the Apology. They thought it advisable, however, to discuss some points of controversy on the basis of the Augsburg Confession: (1) justification; man is justified by faith alone. (2) Good works; new obedience is necessary in the justified. (3) The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; Christ is really present in the Lord's Supper. (4) Adiaphora; minor ceremonies may be used or omitted without sin and detriment. Then follows a number of resolutions upon which the princes had agreed; new controversies should not be divulged, but examined by the consistories and superintendents; no theological treatises should be printed without having gone through the hands of the censor; the publication of libelous treatises should be strictly prohibited; consistories and superintendents should be instructed to depose from his office any one who taught or acted in disagreement with the confession; the old differences should be forgiven and forgotten to make possible an agreement of all Evangelical estates on the basis of this recess; the other estates should be invited to join the recess.

The recess was received differently in various places. For some the real presence of Christ was not taught with sufficient emphasis. Others censured the recess because heresies were not specially noted and condemned. Others again complained because secular princes had assumed the right to decide on ecclesiastical doctrines without the consultation of theologians. But the strongest opposition came from Jena and Weimar. In Weimar Amsdorf at the order of John Frederick of Saxony attacked the recess, and in Jena Flacius wrote two replies, which seem to have been circulated in manuscript only—*Refutatio Samaritani Interim, in quo vera religio cum sectis et corrupte lis scelerate et perniciose confunditur*, and *Grund und Ursach, warum das Frankfurter Interim in keinem Weg anzunehmen*. The same arguments were used by the theologians whom John Frederick of Saxony asked in 1558 to reply to the invitation of the six princes to join the recess. They were answered by Melanchthon at the order of the electoral court, in a treatise entitled *Responsum Melanchthonis de censura formulæ pacis Francofordianæ, scripta a Theologis Wimariensibus* (Sept. 24, 1558, in *CR*, ix. 617 sqq.). John Frederick did not succeed in gathering the opponents of the recess in Magdeburg; but on the other hand, the purpose of the recess to settle the controversies was not attained.

(C. Enders.)

Bibliography: The document is best preserved in *CR*, ix. 489 sqq. A monograph is J. F. Lebret, *De recessu Francofurti, 1558*, Tübingen, 1796. C. A. Salig, *Historie der augsburgischen Confession*, iii. 363 sqq., Halle, 1745; G. J. Planck, *Geschichte . . . unsers protestantischen Lehr-*

begriffs, vi. 174 sqq., Leipsic, 1800; W. Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, ii. 70, Erlangen, 1861; J. C. L. Gieseler, *Church History*, ed. H. B. Smith, iv. 444 sqq., New York, 1868 (valuable as a summary).

FRANKFORT RESPITE: A temporary agreement between German Roman Catholics and Protestants, signed at Frankfort Apr. 19, 1539. After the diet at Schmalkalden (Feb., 1537), where the Protestant estates refused to attend a council summoned at Mantua, the Catholics and Protestants were more vehemently opposed to each other than ever. The Protestants were strong, and they threatened to become dangerous to the emperor if they formed an alliance with Francis I. of France. The outbreak of war seemed imminent. Under these circumstances Dr. Held, the imperial commissioner, found it necessary to unite the Catholic estates, and agreed with King Ferdinand to form a Catholic league of defense, after the model of the Schmalkald League. After difficult negotiations the so-called Nuremberg League was formed on June 10, 1538. The membership, however, was small, the ecclesiastical estates almost all keeping aloof, and the league did not attain any importance. The political situation compelled the emperor to seek the aid of the Protestants against the Turks, and against Duke William of Jülich-Cleve-Berg, who had made himself duke of Geldern and, since the death of his father, united four duchies under his power and tried to come in touch with the Schmalkald League. Moreover, the emperor was in financial straits. Therefore the archbishop of Lund was commissioned to negotiate with the Protestants, who since Feb. 14, 1539, had been assembled at Frankfort. They required nothing less than an unconditional peace for all time, including those who might still join the Augsburg Confession. The Catholics were not willing to concede so much; but finally the following agreement was arrived at. All adherents of the Augsburg Confession, not merely those included in the Peace of Nuremberg (see NUREMBERG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF), should be granted a respite of six months. During that time no actions should be taken against them, and the ban which had been imposed upon Minden on Oct. 9, 1538, should be suspended. The Evangelicals bound themselves not to refuse aid against the Turks and not to deprive clerics of their revenues with the exception of what they needed for the support of their own parishes, schools, and hospitals. The respite should last eighteen months or till Aug. 1, 1540. Its importance is not great, but peace was at least secured for a short time for those who had been won over to the Evangelical cause since the Peace of Nuremberg; and still more important was the fact that there was no talk of a council; the agreement promised that a Christian union should be discussed at a diet to be held in Nuremberg, without the presence of papal legates. Thus the period of religious colloquies was inaugurated.

(T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: O. Meinardus, in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, xxii. 605–654, Göttingen, 1882; M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel Bucers mit Landgraf Philipp*, pp. 70–75, Leipsic, 1880; O. Winckelmann, *Strassburgs politische Correspondenz*, ii. 549 sqq., 560 sqq., Strasburg, 1887; F. von Bezold, *Reformationsgeschichte*, pp. 685 sqq., Berlin, 1891; W. Friedensburg, *Nuntiaturberichte*, ii. 294 sqq., Gotha, 1892; Moeller, *Christian Church*, iii. 283–287.

FRANKFORT, SYNOD OF, 794: A gathering convened by Charlemagne at Frankfort, attended, according to later writers, by 300 bishops from Germany, Gaul, England, Spain, and Italy, and two delegates of the pope. Fifty-six canons are ascribed to it, the most important being the first, condemning Felix and Elipandus, the leaders of the Adoptionists; and the second, condemning the decisions of the Second Council of Nicæa (787) concerning image-worship, which had been accepted by Pope Adrian I. See ADOPTIONISM; CAROLINE BOOKS; IMAGES AND IMAGE-WORSHIP, II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 678–693; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. xiii.

FRANKINCENSE: An aromatic substance made of the resin secured from the bark of different trees, particularly *Boswellia serrata*. The Hebrew term is *lebhonah*, and the Arabic cognate is *luban;* the term frankincense means "free (-burning) incense." The gum is a product of South Arabia and was known to commerce as early at least as the seventeenth century B.C.; it was never cultivated in Palestine, and the word for the so-called dark frankincense from Lebanon is usually translated by the word "myrrh." The trade in frankincense was important; there was a deity whose significance was due to his function as a protector of the industry and the growth of the material; it is believed that the name Ethiopia comes from the word meaning "collector of frankincense." The gathering of the raw material was associated with peculiar customs, the product being regarded as the blood of a tree the soul of which was a divinity. The best kind was that known as masculine frankincense (Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, xii. 32). The substance became an article of luxury; wine was spiced with it, it figured in the presents to kings (cf. Matt. ii. 11), and it was burned at their burial (II Chron. xvi. 14, xxi. 19; Jer. xxxiv. 5). It was indispensable at heathen worship (II Kings xxiii. 5; Isa. lxv. 3; Jer. xliv. 17 sqq.). For its employment among the Hebrews see INCENSE.

(R. ZEHNPFUND.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. E. Post, *Flora of Syria, Palestine and Sinai*, Beirut, 1896; Stade, in *ZATW*, iii (1883), 143 sqq., 168 sqq.; F. Hommel, *Altisraelitische Ueberlieferungen*, pp. 279 sqq., Munich, 1897; idem, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, vol. ii. passim, ib. 1900; idem, *Die Insel der Seligen*, pp. 12, 18, ib. 1901; *DB*, ii. 65, 469; *EB*, ii. 1563–64; *JE*, v 494–495.

FRANKS: A name applied after the middle of the third century to the Germanic tribes of Chattic descent dwelling on the middle and lower Rhine, who during the decline of the Roman power became the most formidable enemies of the empire. In spite of repeated defeats they succeeded in making themselves masters of the Roman possessions on the lower Rhine, establishing themselves in Batavia, Toxandria or Holland, Zealand, and Brabant. A distinction in names now appears between the inhabitants of the coastlands or Salic Franks and the dwellers on the banks of the Rhine or Ripuarians. In the course of time the left bank of the Rhine, the basins of the Scheldt and the Somme, and the valley of the Moselle came into their power; their victory over Syagrius at Soissons in 486

shattered the Roman power in Gaul and extended their authority to the Loire; their victory over the Visigoths in 507 carried it to the Garonne, while on the east the overthrow of the Alemanni (496) and of the Thuringians (531) made the Neckar and the Rednitz the boundary of their kingdom. On the east bank of the Rhine the inhabitants remained purely Germanic, but in Gaul the Frankish element was speedily absorbed by the Roman and the Romanized Celtic.

The great episode in the advance of the Franks was the conversion of their king Clovis in the year 496. That he was from the beginning no enemy to Christianity is shown by the fact that his wife was of that faith and that his sons were baptized with his permission. His own conversion was primarily actuated by the belief that the step was necessary for the preservation of his kingdom. The common legend that Clovis while hard pressed in battle by the Alemanni made a vow of baptism if the god of the Christians would grant him victory finds no historical substantiation. On the contrary, his conversion seems to have been the result of deliberation and to have been hastened by the exhortations of his Christian wife. The baptism of Clovis is of primary importance in the history of the Church in that it rallied to its support the most powerful of the barbarian kingdoms and thus insured the triumph of Christianity among the Germanic tribes. Moreover, it marked the beginning of the end of Arianism and guaranteed the unity of the Church in the West. The conversion of the Frankish king was followed by that of his people, but the new faith made unequal progress in the different parts of his dominions, most in Gaul, least in the Germanic territories to the east of the Rhine, where, as late as the beginning of the eighth century, the greater part of Hesse was still pagan. The organization of the Church under Clovis remained unchanged. The Gallic and Rhenish bishoprics extended their influence across the Rhine where no new sees were created. The Church remained in possession of the rights which it had enjoyed under the Romans, but in the course of time the king succeeded in gaining the right of confirming the nomination of bishops and summoning the church assemblies, powers which, together with the restriction of the papal jurisdiction, made the Frankish Church a truly national one, a character which it retained throughout the Merovingian period. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Sources are, Gregory of Tours, *Opera*, in *MGH, Script. rer. Merov.*, vol. i,. 1885; Fredegar, *Chronicarum libri*, ib. vols. ii.–iii., 1888, 1896; *MGH, Legum*, Sect. II., *Capitularia reg. Franc.*, vols. i.–ii., 1883, 1890; *Diplomata reg. Franc.*, in *MGH, Dipl.*, vol. i., 1872; *MGH, Concilia ævi Merov.*, vol. i., 1892; *Epistolæ Merov.*; *et Karoli ævi*, in *MGH, Epist.*, iii., vol. i., 1892; *Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum scriptores*, ed. M. Bouquet, 23 vols., Paris, 1738–1876; E. Le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, 2 vols., Paris, 1856–65.

Excellent modern reconstructions of history are found in Rettberg, *KD*, vol. i.; Friedrich, *KD*; Hauck, *KD*, i. 99 sqq. Consult further: Fustel de Coulanges, *Hist. des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, Paris, 1875; H. Chevalier, *Hist. de la France, 395–1270*, ib. 1882; V Gantite, *Rénovation de l'hist. des Franks*, Brussels, 1883, H. von Schubert, *Die Unterwerfung der Alamannen unter die Franken*, Strasburg, 1884; J. Havet, *Questions Mérovingiennes*, Paris, 1885; E. A. Freeman, *Teutonic Conquest in Gaul*, London, 1888; J. B. Lucotte, *Établissement du Christianisme dans les Gaules*, Dijon, 1888; A. Thierry, *Récits des temps Merovingiennes*, London, 1888; I. Favé, *L'Empire des Francs*, Paris, 1889; Melin, *Hist. de la France, 395–1270*, Moulins, 1890; W E. Collins, *Early Hist. of Frisia*, London, 1891; H. Froidevaux, *Étude sur la "Lex dicta Francorum Chamavorum,"* Paris, 1891; B. L. H. Martin, *Les Origines de la France*, ib. 1891; M. Lipp, *Die Marken des Frankenreiches unter Karl dem Grossen*, Königsberg, 1892; A. Schiber, *Die fränkischen und alemannischen Siedlungen in Gallien*, Strasburg, 1894; F. Dahn, *Die Franken unter den Merovingen und den Karolingen*, Leipsic, 1895–99; O. Havard, *Clovis. France au Ve. siècle*, Paris, 1896; G. Kurth, *Clovis*, Tours, 1896; M. Prou, *La Gaule mérovingienne*, Paris, 1897; L. Sergeant, *The Franks*, London, 1898; P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Origines religieuses de la France*, Paris, 1900.

FRATERNITIES. See Confraternities, Religious.

FRATICELLI: An antiecclesiastical sect which developed in the latter part of the thirteenth century from the Observantine Franciscans. The name of "little brothers" was originally applied to the strict Franciscan Observantines whom Celestine V had united with his own order in 1292 and who, after the suppression of the Celestines (q.v.) by Boniface VIII. ten years later, had continued their opposition to the Conventual Minorites. Later becoming a general designation of all separatistic Observantine Franciscans, the term Fraticelli gradually acquired a sinister connotation, being applied to heretics of the most dangerous type and equivalent to Beghards, Bizochi ("wallet-carrying vagabonds," from Fr. *besace*, "wallet"), Lollards, and similar epithets. The Fraticelli quickly spread throughout Italy, southern France, Flanders, and portions of Germany, despite the Inquisition. Their principal Italian leaders were the Observantine Angelus de Clareno in the east-central part, Enrico de Ceca in Tuscany, the Celestine hermits of Mount Majella in Abruzzi, and Duke Lodovico de Durazzo in southern Italy, while in Achæa and the Peloponnesus they were harbored by the Latin princes, forming both here and in the south of Italy an organized hierarchy under their own bishops in opposition to the Church.

In life and practise the Fraticelli differed from the Observantines chiefly in that they desired to be entirely independent both of the Minorites and of the Church and its hierarchy. Their garb was uncouth and they wore short cowls and dirty wallets to distinguish themselves from the Franciscans. They also rejected the Roman Catholic Church as fallen from Christian purity, and considered the popes since Celestine V. or at least since John XXII. as usurpers, while the sacraments administered by priests were held to be inefficacious and papal indulgences worthless. The Fraticelli were subjected to severe persecution as a result of the bull of condemnation issued by John XXII. on Jan. 23, 1318, especially in Toulouse and its vicinity, in Italy after 1321 and again after 1350, repeatedly in Flanders after 1322, and in Florence even in the fourteenth century, while a number were put to death in Rome as late as 1466. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: F. Ehrle, in *Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte*, i (1885), 509–570; ii (1886), 106–164; iii (1887), 553–623; A. Limborch, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, 1816; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, vols. ii–iii., New York,

1906; J. J. I. Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte*, ii. 417 sqq., 606 sqq., Munich, 1890; F. Tocco, in *Bolletino della società storica Abruzzese*, 1895, pp. 117–159; A. Hausrath, *Die Arnoldisten*, pp. 262 sqq., Leipsic, 1895; *KL*, iv. 1926–36.

FRAYSSINOUS, DENIS, COUNT OF: French Roman Catholic; b. at Curières (200 m. s.w. of Lyons), Department of Aveyron, May 9, 1765; d. at St. Geniez, also in Aveyron, Dec. 12, 1841. He was originally intended for the law, but his own inclinations led him into theology. After the signing of the concordat of 1801 (see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, VI. 1, § 1) he became the leader of a great agitation against the materialism and atheism of current philosophy. Although he was a zealous royalist, the government offered no opposition to him, even making him an inspector in the Paris Academy and giving him a canonry in Notre Dame. Finally in 1809 his discourses at the Church of St. Sulpice were prohibited; but they were resumed on the restoration of the Bourbons. On the return of Napoleon from Elba, Frayssinous fled to the mountains of Aveyron, where he lived till he was recalled by Louis XVIII. In quick succession he now became grand almoner, court preacher, titular bishop of Hermopolis, grand officer of the Legion of Honor, a count and a peer of France. As minister of public instruction and ecclesiastical affairs he supported Charles X. in his plan to make Jesuitism dominant in legislation. Deprived of his offices by the July Revolution, he went into exile with Charles X. (1830), but returned to France in 1838, living thenceforth in retirement. His principal works are, *Les Vrais Principes de l'Église gallicane* (Paris, 1818); and *Defense de Christianisme* (3 vols., 1825, new ed., 2 vols., 1889; Eng. transl., *A Defence of Christianity*, 2 vols., London, 1836). (C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Guizot, *Méditations sur l'état actuel de la religion chrétienne*, pp. 66–70, Paris, 1866; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vol. v.

FRECHT, freht, **MARTIN:** German Reformer; b. at Ulm 1494; d. at Tübingen Sept. 14, 1556. He was the son of a councilor and master of the shoemakers' gild. He matriculated at Heidelberg in 1513 for theology and philosophy, and was dean of the faculty of arts from 1523 to 1526, professor of theology after 1529, and rector of the university and provisor domus Dionysianæ in 1530–31. He ranked as one of the leading humanists and discovered in the monastery of Eberbach the Saxon chronicle of Widukind, which he published at Basel in 1532. He listened with enthusiasm to Luther's disputation at Heidelberg (April 26, 1518), and was a friend of Brenz, Isenmann, Löner, Butzer, Schnepf, Blaurer, Capito, and Œcolampadius, while in 1524 he became acquainted with Melanchthon. In 1531 he was recalled to Ulm to teach the Bible to the clergy, monks and students, and became pastor of the church at Ulm in 1533. His sensitive nature and his lack of practical experience in church work hindered him greatly, but he labored faithfully to promote the interests of his struggling church by synods and visitations. The conflicts with the enthusiasts, Anabaptists, Sebastian Frank, and Caspar Schwenckfeld (qq.v.) who lived in Ulm, and together with the evident need of an understanding between the Protestants of northern and southern Germany, impelled Frecht to join Butzer in approaching Luther. He was a colleague of Butzer in the conference with the South Germans at Constance (Dec. 15, 1534), and of Butzer and Blaurer in the disputation with Schwenckfeld at Tübingen (May 28, 1535), while he also attended the Wittenberg Concordia in 1536, the deliberations at Frankfort in 1539, the convention at Schmalkald in 1540 (where he secured the condemnation of Frank and Schwenckfeld), and the conferences at Worms in 1540, and Regensburg in 1541 and 1546. In 1543 he made peace between the ministers at Biberach, and three years later he was sent to Dillingen by the Schmalkald League to begin a reformistic propaganda in the diocese of Augsburg. The disastrous termination of the Schmalkald war, however, obliged him to return to Ulm, but the rejection of the Interim exasperated the emperor, and on Aug. 16, 1548, Frecht and other ministers of Ulm were imprisoned in the fortress of Kirchheim. He was released, though on hard terms, Mar. 3, 1549, and then went to Nuremberg, which he left for Blaubeuren, where he lived under the protection of Duke Ulrich of Württemberg. In 1551 Duke Christopher appointed him inspector of the theological seminary at Tübingen, where he lectured on Matthew and Genesis. In the following year he became professor of theology, and rector in 1555.

G. BOSSERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Serpilius, *Epitaphia*, pp. 67 sqq., Regensburg, 1707–10; L. M. Fischlin, *Memoria theologorum Wirtembergensium*, i. 42, supplement, pp. 36 sqq., Ulm, 1709–10; A. Weyermann, *Nachrichten von Gelehrten aus Ulm*, Ulm, 1798; T. Keim, *Reformation der Reichstadt Ulm*, Stuttgart, 1851; Keidel, in *Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte*, 1866, pp. 204–223; the letters of Frecht in *Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte*, 1881, pp. 252–255, 1882, pp. 251–265; G. Bossert, *Das Interim in Württemberg*, Halle, 1895; S. Fischer, *Chronik von Ulm*, ed. K. G. Vesenmeyer, Ulm, 1896; *ADB*, vii. 325–327.

FREDERIC OF HEILO: Dutch ecclesiastic; b. at Heilo (17 m. n.w. of Amsterdam), Holland, in the early part of the fifteenth century; d. near Haarlem (14 m. w. of Amsterdam) Oct. 11, 1455. It is uncertain whether he belonged to the monastery of St. Willibrord at Heilo, but he is described as a priest and oblate in the monastery of the Visitation near Haarlem, where his superior was John à Kempis, brother of the more famous Thomas. He also acted as confessor in the monastery at Warmond, possibly in the house of the Brethren of the Common Life. Later he resided at Leyden and in a nunnery at Bereswijk. According to a letter of his the nuns so embittered his life that, to regain peace of soul, he returned to his monastery. His writings are extant in two manuscripts, and comprise the following works: *Epistola contra pluralitatem confessorum et de regimine sororum*, proving that a nunnery should have but one confessor; an epistle of similar content advising that women should not be governed but should be instructed by men; a letter to a priest who had entered into a monastery governed by strict seclusion, warning him to beware of losing his spirituality through contact with the world. *Apologia super resignatione regiminis sororum* (ed. J. C. Pool, see below); epistle to a monk concerning his moral life; *Trac-*

tatus de peregrinantibus contra peregrinantes, a polemic against the misuse of pilgrimages solely for the sake of indulgences (ed. Pool); and *liber de fundatione domus regularium prope Haerlem*, a chronicle extant only in fragments, but important on account of its information concerning the ecclesiastical and moral conditions of the times, especially the year of jubilee 1450 and Nicholas of Cusa. In addition to these extant writings, the following works, now lost, are also mentioned: *De inclusione religiosorum, alterum de eadem materia; De dignitate sacerdotali; De doctrina peccati venialis et mortalis, sive contra nimis scrupulosos et de remediis; De officiis rectoris sive pastoris; De collectione mentis in se; De choreis; Contra sacerdotem lubricum sive consolatio super infamia fratris; Contra detractores religiosorum; De fonte qui ascendit de paradiso; De imagine et similitudine Dei; Carmina de sancta Basilia in Warmunda quiescente; De festivitatibus beatæ Mariæ virginis; Sermones de tempore et de sanctis*, and *Epistolare satis pulchrum*. The standpoint of Frederic was ethical rather than mystical, although he was a faithful adherent of medieval theology with its semi-Pelagian tendency.

L. SCHULZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The one biography is by J. C. Pool, *Frederic van Heilo en zijn schriften*, Amsterdam, 1866 (written at the suggestion of Moll the historian). Consult also J. G. R. Acquoy, *Het Klooster te Windesheim*, Utrecht, 1875.

FREDERICK III., THE PIOUS: Elector of the Palatinate; b. at Simmern (26 m. s.w. of Coblenz) Feb. 14, 1515; d. Oct. 26, 1576. He was strictly educated in the Roman faith at his father's court and at Cologne, but, influenced by his wife, the pious princess Maria of Brandenburg, whom he married in 1537, he followed the Reformation, and in 1546 made a public profession of his faith. He succeeded his father as duke of Simmern, May 18, 1557, and became elector Feb. 12, 1559, on the death of Otto Henry. Under his predecessor strict Lutherans like Tilemann Hesshusen, Melanchthonians, and Calvinists had found a place in the Palatinate. In the summer of 1559 bitter controversies arose among them. Theses on the Lord's Supper prepared by the Heidelberg deacon Klebitz provoked a bitter controversy between him and Hesshusen. When efforts at mediation failed Frederick deposed both, Sept. 16. To get a clear understanding of the controversy Frederick spent days and nights in theological studies and was thus led more and more to the Reformed confession. A disputation held in June, 1560, between the Saxon theologians Stössel and Mörlin and the Heidelberg Boquin, Erast, and Einhorn increased Frederick's dislike for the Lutheran zealots. After the Naumburg Convention (Jan., 1561; see NAUMBURG CONVENTION) Frederick fully adopted the Reformed dogmas. In March, 1561, he called Emmanuel Tremellius, and in September the famous Zacharias Ursinus, to Heidelberg. The whole Church was now transformed. Caspar Olevianus had been there since Jan., 1560. Images of the saints, vestments, baptismal fonts, and other "idolatrous works," even organs, were ruthlessly removed from the churches. In the celebration of the Lord's Supper the breaking of bread was introduced. The revenues from monasteries and foundations were confiscated and applied to Evangelical church purposes or charity. The Heidelberg catechism prepared by Ursinus and Olevianus now served as the norm of doctrine and for the instruction of the youth. The church-order of Nov. 15, 1563, and the consistory order of 1564 closed the changes. The opposition of ministers inclining to Lutheranism was suppressed by their dismission. Among the Lutherans Frederick's measures caused a great sensation. The religious colloquy held at Maulbronn, Apr., 1564 (see MAULBRONN) increased the animosity. In 1565 the Emperor Maximilian ordered to annul the changes made. A unanimous decree of the diet held at Augsburg in 1566 also demanded the abolition of the changes. Frederick, however, declared in a session of the diet, May 14, that a matter was concerned over which God alone has the rule, and if it was intended to proceed against him, he would find comfort in the promises of his Savior. The decree was not carried out. After completing the work of reform in the Rhine Palatinate Frederick endeavored to continue it in the Upper Palatinate; but here he was resisted by the zealous Lutheran estates. He continued his work of reform on the Rhine by introducing in 1570 a strict church discipline. A stain on Frederick's life is the sentence of death which he pronounced on the antitrinitarian Johannes Silvanus based on the opinion signed by Olevianus, Ursinus, and Boquin, and which he had executed after long hesitation, Dec. 23, 1572. In other matters he was an excellent, intelligent, truly pious ruler, who wished to promote the welfare of his people in every way. With the Reformed abroad he had intimate connections. In 1562 he gave Frankenthal for a refuge to the Evangelicals driven from the Netherlands. His like-minded son John Casimir he sent in 1567 and again in 1576 to France in aid of the Huguenots. In 1569 he assisted also the Count Palatine Wolfgang on his way to France. His last years were troubled by domestic afflictions. As his older son Louis was a strict Lutheran, he could not hope that after his death his work would be carried out in his own spirit. JULIUS NEY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His letters were edited by A. Kluckhohn, 2 vols., Brunswick, 1868–72; and this editor also wrote his life, Nördlingen, 1879, also the sketch in *ADB*, vii. 606 sqq. Consult also L. Häusser, *Geschichte der rheinischen Pfalz*, ii. 1–85, Heidelberg, 1856; K. Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, Elberfeld, 1857; K. Menzel, *Wolfgang von Zweibrücken*, Munich, 1893; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 596–598; Moeller, *Christian Church*, iii. passim; *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 595–596, 619, New York, 1904.

FREDERICK III., THE WISE: Elector of Saxony 1486–1525; b. at Torgau (31 m. e.n.e. of Leipsic) Jan. 17, 1463; d. at Lochau (now Annaburg, 40 m. n.e. of Leipsic) May 5, 1525. He received the electoral dignity after the death of his father, Ernest, and governed the other Ernestine territories in union with his brother, John the Steadfast (q.v.). This article will consider only his attitude in religion and church polity. He did not originate an established Church in Germany, as

His Religious Nature.

some have believed, but, while his predecessors and other princes were prompted chiefly by political motives, the purely religious interest was strongest in Frederick. He was the model of a pious prince of the medieval kind. He lived and moved in the forms of churchly devotion peculiar to his time, and they fully satisfied his religious nature. He received his first instruction in the school at Grimma, where the Augustinians possessed a flourishing monastery, and from that time he showed a predilection for their order. In 1493 he traveled to the Holy Land, with a large suite, but as a mere pilgrim. He was devoted to the worship of saints like all pious men of his time. In his church at Wittenberg he had the choicest collection of relics that could be found in Germany. Most of them he had probably bought on his pilgrimage for large sums; others he brought from a journey to the Netherlands, which he undertook in 1494, and he never tired of adding new treasures. A catalogue of the collection printed in 1509 (cf. the *Wittenberger Heiligtumsbuch*, ed. G. Hirth, Munich, 1883) contains no less than 5,005 entries. The relics opened the way to the free granting of indulgences; any one who visited the collection was assured of the forgiveness of his sins for a hundred years. It is therefore not to be assumed that Frederick when he founded a university at Wittenberg in 1502 meant to break with the past, by receiving adherents of what was later called humanism.

Frederick probably heard of Luther for the first time in 1512 when Johann von Staupitz (q.v.), the general vicar of the Augustinians, asked him to defray the expenses of promotion for the poor but promising monk. It seems to have been Staupitz also who directed the attention of the elector to the study of the Bible as the only certain source of salvation; and he became an earnest student of Scripture. It might be supposed that Luther's theses concerning indulgences were likely to arouse the anger of the elector, devoted as he was to the practise and to the worship of saints. But he was too large-hearted and possessed too noble a nature. Luther was mistaken, however, when he thought that Frederick's intention to protect him and not to allow his removal to Rome originated in his "wonderful inclination toward his theology." The attitude of the elector was due rather to his love of justice, which could not endure that Luther should be delivered to his enemies without having been convicted, and to his wish to save for his university as long as possible one of its most celebrated teachers, as may be plainly seen from his letter to Staupitz, Apr. 8, 1518 (T. Kolde, *Johann von Staupitz*, Gotha, 1879, p. 314). Because he shrank from interfering with the will of God, it was the policy of the elector neither to approve nor disapprove of Luther's actions, but to let him fight out his own convictions. He himself, however, clung to his saints and relics; in 1520 the number of the latter had increased to 19,013.

Relations with Luther.

Then followed the great events of 1520, the bull of excommunication against Luther, the publication of his great reformatory writings, the appeal to a council, the burning of the papal bull, etc. Without misjudging the seriousness of the condition, Frederick did not recede from his course, repeating his demand that Luther's cause should be entrusted to learned and unprejudiced judges. As an obedient and faithful son of the Church, however the thought never entered his mind to defend Luther's doctrine; as a layman, he did not pretend to understand anything of it. He followed the same policy at the diet of Worms. Luther, he insisted, should be convicted of heresy only according to the established principles and forms of law. In confidential letters he showed a cordial interest in the persecuted monk, but at the diet he took great pains not to show it and to avoid all intercourse with him. It was undoubtedly due to the influence of his brother, John of Saxony, who was a devoted Lutheran, that Frederick protected Luther after the diet. He probably gave his councilors an order in a general way to guard Luther, without definite directions, since for a long time neither the elector nor his brother knew that Luther was in the Wartburg. At any rate, it was not the intention of Frederick to protect the cause of Luther, but only his person. He soon perceived, however, that his action had furthered the cause in the most powerful way.

Now the hardest and most troublesome years of his life began. No prince ever faced a more difficult and responsible task than Frederick before the disturbances and innovations in Wittenberg; but seldom has a prince practised greater self-renunciation. Everything that he loved so dearly was gradually deprived of its value, and although he always counseled moderation, he was not willing to stem the tide because he did not wish to act against the word of God, and the new movement might perhaps be his will. As a layman he tolerated everything in religion as long as the public order was not disturbed. But his opponents did not acknowledge the justness of this standpoint and made him responsible for everything that happened in the Saxon churches. In 1523 he consented to make an end of the worship of relics in the Catholic Church. The abolition of the mass must have cut deeply into his heart, but his opposition was of no avail. He could not be induced, however, to advocate himself the introduction of reforms.

Attitude Toward the Wittenberg Reforms.

Evidently he had become more and more absorbed in the study of Luther's doctrine and especially of the Gospel, under the influence of his faithful adviser and secretary Georg Spalatin (q.v.), an intimate friend of Luther He strove with his whole heart to live according to the Gospel and fulfil God's will. However severely Luther had attacked his favorite devotion and whatever trouble and care Luther's actions had caused him, he always retained for him the same inclination, and accepted the advice of Spalatin regarding him; but he still avoided all direct contact with Luther. Luther hardly ever saw him, except at the Diet of Worms, and never spoke to him. Only when the hour of death arrived, did he send for Luther; but then it

Accepts the Reformed Faith on His Death-bed.

was too late. Luther was far away in the Hartz mountains, trying to quell the rebellion of the peasants, which embittered the last days of the peace-loving prince but did not shake his trust in God. Spalatin consoled him on his death-bed. Before his death, he partook of the Lord's Supper in both kinds, from full conviction, and thus openly avowed the Evangelical doctrine and joined himself to the Evangelical Church. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Spalatin, *Friedrich des Weisen Leben und Zeitgeschichte*, Jena, 1851; M. M. Tutzschmann, *Friedrich der Weise*, Grimma, 1848; G. L. Plitt, *Friedrich der Weise als Schirmherr der Reformation*, Erlangen, 1863; T. Kolde, *Friedrich der Weise und die Anfänge der Reformation*, ib. 1881; J. Köstlin, in *TSK*, lv (1882), 691 sqq.; idem, *Friedrich der Weise und die Schlosskirche zu Wittenberg*, Wittenberg, 1892; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., *The Reformation*, pp. 41, 116, 132–172, 606, New York, 1904; Creighton, *Papacy*, vol. vi. passim; and the biographies under LUTHER, MARTIN.

FREE CHURCH: A name given to certain religious bodies in various countries of Europe, in some cases chosen by the organization itself, indicating somewhat loosely secession from an older and larger communion, independence of the dominant ecclesiastical authorities, and separation from an established church. For the so-called Free Churches of England, France, Holland, Italy, and Switzerland, see the articles upon each country. For the Free Churches of Germany see LUTHERANS, II; also FREE CONGREGATIONS. For the Free Church of Scotland see PRESBYTERIANS. In America the name "free church" is sometimes given to a congregation which does not rent sittings at a fixed charge, but derives its revenues from the spontaneous contributions of attendants. See VOLUNTARYISM.

FREE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: A small Protestant organization which broke off from the Church of England (see ENGLAND, CHURCH OF) in 1844 because of antagonism to the Oxford Movement (see TRACTARIANISM). Being free from State control, it claims the right to enter any parish where advanced ritualism prevails, and to establish a liturgical service on the basis of the Evangelical party of the Anglican Church. Its churches are widely scattered throughout England, although their number is small. It is governed by its own convocation and by its few bishops, consecrated by Bishop Cummins (q.v.) of the American Reformed Episcopal Church. The convocation meets annually in June. Its clergy number twenty-four, and its churches twenty-seven, with accommodations for 8,140. It has 1,352 communicants, 361 Sunday-school teachers, and 4,196 Sunday-school scholars. Though practically identical with the Reformed Episcopal Church of England (see REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH), the two refuse to unite on account of differences respecting government and the rights of the laity.

FREE CHURCH FEDERATION: A union of free churches for Evangelical work. The federation was initiated at a congress of members of free churches in the city of Manchester in November, 1892. That congress was an outward and visible sign of the growth of the inward and spiritual grace of Christian unity, which had been proceeding for at least the two preceding decades. The causes of that development were: (1) the return of the churches to Christ Jesus as the sole and exclusive authority in the life of the soul and in the activities of the churches; (2) the separation between the greater and the lesser truths of revelation effected by the providence of God in these later years; (3) the growth of sacerdotalism within the Anglican Church, and the total inability of Parliament to control and check it; (4) the consequent necessity for a united resistance to this sacerdotalism by Evangelical Protestantism; and (5) the need for more sustained and enthusiastic efforts to carry the Gospel to the people of the large towns and cities. The Congress formed itself into a Federation in 1896. It embraced all the Evangelical denominations claiming spiritual autonomy and refusing to recognize the patronage and control of Parliament. It was the creation of a new organization in which Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and others met, not as denominationalists, but simply as Evangelical Free Churchmen. It was a wider basis of union and fellowship than any hitherto recognized. The sectarian element was totally excluded. It was the Free Church of England, with hopes of becoming the Church of England of the future.

Origin.

The denominations embraced within this federation are as follows: Baptists, Calvinistic Methodists, Churches of Christ, Congregationalists, Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion, Independent Methodists, Moravians, Presbyterians, Primitive Methodists, Reformed Episcopal Church, Salvation Army, Society of Friends, United Methodist Church (formed in 1907 by the union of Bible Christians, Methodist Free Connexion and United Methodist Free Churches), Wesleyan Methodists, and Wesleyan Reform Union. In England and Wales the councils number 915, and the federations 53. The movement is spreading in other countries. In the United States a plan has been adopted for the organization of a Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America representing an aggregate membership of over 17,000,000. The movement is also advancing in South Africa, Jamaica, Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, Japan, Korea, India, Germany, France, and Italy. The statistics for England and Wales (1907) are: Sitting accommodation in places of worship, 8,483,925; communicants, 2,183,914; Sunday-school teachers, 405,391; Sunday-school scholars, 3,471,276. These figures will be better understood if they are compared with the statistics of the Anglican Church: viz., sitting accommodation, 7,240,136; communicants, 2,053,455; Sunday-school teachers, 206,873; Sunday-school scholars, 2,558,240. The international figures (1906) are: Free Church members, 21,731,713; Anglican communicants, 3,830,866.

Membership and Statistics.

The objects of the national council are: (1) to facilitate fraternal intercourse and cooperation among the Evangelical Free Churches; (2) to assist in the organization of local councils; (3) to encourage devotional fellowship and mutual coun-

sel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches; (4) to advocate the New Testament doctrine of the Church, and to defend the rights of the associated churches; and (5) to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life. But the chief work of the Council from the beginning has been directed to the proclamation of the Gospel outside all churches. The Council has employed a body of missioners, of which the chief members are Gipsy Smith, W R. Lane, and Tolfree Parr, to visit the large centers of population and to organize the churches for mission work: and more recently the Rev. F B. Meyer has been set apart for the ministry at large of the churches in England and Wales. Conventions for quickening and nourishing the spiritual life have been held, and a system of parochial visitation has been carried out. Social purity has been promoted, social institutes created, and Girls' Gilds, Auxiliary Societies for Young Free Churchmen have been formed. The Council has also been compelled to devote its energies to the solution of the problem of state education on exclusively civic lines. It has resisted the encroachments of Roman Catholicism through legislation upon the rights of the people; and though it has not formally adopted "passive resistance," yet many of the leaders of the National Council have given that movement their personal support. It has also led crusades against gambling and intemperance. It supports a publication department, from which it has issued *The Free Church Year Book* (1896 sqq.); *The Free Church Catechism* (1899); a series of thirteen volumes on *Eras of Nonconformity* (1904 sqq.); *Little Books on the Devout Life*, ed. F. B. Meyer (1904 sqq.); *The Free Church Council Hymnal* (1906); *The Work of the Free Church Council; a Manual for Secretaries and others* (1906); various biographies, including those of Dr. Clifford and Gipsy Smith, with miscellaneous literature bearing on the work; and *The Free Church Chronicle*, the official organ of the movement.

Objects and Work.

JOHN CLIFFORD.

FREE CONGREGATIONS IN GERMANY.

The Friends of Light, or Protestant Friends (§ 1).
The Formation of Free Congregations (§ 2).
The Free Congregations Since 1858 (§ 3).

The name "Free Congregations" (Germ. *Freie Gemeinden*) is given in Germany to certain religious bodies which have separated from the State Churches, yet are distinct from the so-called Free Churches of Germany (for which see LUTHERANS, II). In the fifth decade of the nineteenth century a movement arose in Prussian Saxony, the adherents of which were popularly named "Friends of Light" (*Lichtfreunde*), though they first styled themselves "Protestant Friends." The external provocation for this movement was the disciplining of Pastor W F Sinteris at Madgeburg, because he had characterized prayer to Christ as superstition. Certain circles, offended by this procedure on the part of the Magdeburg Consistory, found a leader and organizer in Pastor Leberecht Uhlich in 1841. The movement underwent greater extension at the hands of Pastor Gustav Adolf Wislicenus in Halle, who on occasion of the seventh convention of those who favored it, at Köthen, May 29, 1844, discussed the question whether Holy Scripture, or the living spirit indwelling within us, is to be regarded as norm of the Protestant type of religious consciousness. From ecclesiastical circles there ensued sharp and deprecatory expressions of opinion, and the Friends of Light soon came into conflict with the church authorities. The Breslau theological professor, David Schulz (q.v.), forfeited his position as consistorial councilor. But greater interest by far was aroused by the deposition of Pastor Wislicenus, on Apr. 23, 1846, "on account of gross injury to the liturgical and doctrinal ordinances in force in the Evangelical State Church." The publication of his book *Die Bibel im Lichte der Bildung unserer Zeit* (Magdeburg, 1853), subjected him to the penalty of a two years' imprisonment, adjudged by the court at Halle, though he escaped the same by flight to America. He returned to Europe in 1866. His later works, *Die Bibel, für denkende Leser betrachtet* (Leipsic, 1863; 2d ed., 1866), and *Entweder—oder. Glaube oder Wissenschaft. Schrift oder Geist* (1868), show that he consistently adhered to his earlier radical views. He died Oct. 14, 1875. Even before Wislicenus was compelled to leave the State Church, the schismatic pastor, Julius Rupp, in Königsberg, had been deposed on Sept. 17, 1845, "on account of repeated violation of his official obligations by reason of gross negligence." Uhlich, after prolonged proceedings, voluntarily withdrew from the State Church. He died Mar. 23, 1872. Deacon W. E. Baltzer of Delitzsch resigned his ecclesiastical office on account of his non-confirmation as pastor at Nordhausen in 1847, and Pastor Adolf Timotheus Wislicenus, the "physical and intellectual brother" of the one mentioned above, accepted the consequences of his doctrinal standpoint and withdrew from the State Church.

1. The Friends of Light, or Protestant Friends.

These collisions with church authorities acquired a greater significance, in that they furnished the first incentive and became the means toward establishing congregations outside the State Church. At Königsberg such a congregation had come into existence as early as Dec. 16, 1845, and had organized itself, on Jan. 19, 1846, as a "Free Evangelical Congregation." Other free congregations arose at Neumarkt in Silesia; at Halle, Nordhausen, Halberstadt, Magdeburg, Hamburg, and Marburg. The attitude of the various governments in relation to both the German Catholic (see GERMAN CATHOLICISM), and the Free Protestant movement, down to the year 1848, was not quite uniform, though evincing the same general character. In so far as the movement was regarded as a product of the revolutionary spirit, the government looked upon it with great distrust, and sought to obviate its further encroachments by the application of statutory means. Finally, the outbreak of the Revolution in Mar., 1848, afforded the "Free" religious move-

2. The Formation of Free Congregations.

ment the desired complete freedom, and gained for it, at the outset, a large increase. New congregations arose in the Province of Saxony, in the Province of Brandenburg, in Brunswick, in the Anhalt duchies, in the kingdom of Saxony, in Silesia, East and West Prussia, in Nassau, Hesse Darmstadt, and elsewhere; all told there were more than seventy new establishments. At their height, the total number of German Catholics and "Free Protestants" in Germany—who are not subject to separate enumeration—amounted to approximately 150,000.

But from 1850 forward, the German governments once again confronted the free religious movement in a hostile spirit. The most pronounced complaints, on the side of the Free Congregations, were proffered against the government in Prussia. A circular of the Minister of the Interior, Sept. 29, 1851, declared that the dissenting associations were not simply religious societies, but rather political unions, furthering the subversion of the civil and social order; and that by reason of insight into the proper nature of these societies, it had grown to be the peremptory duty of the State Government to oppose them with every legitimate agency. It was only when Prince William of Prussia, later King William I., assumed the regency, in Oct., 1858, that the free operation of their principles was finally secured them.

On June 16 and 17, 1859, a large contingent of the German Catholic and Free Protestant congregations united in the Bund freireligiöser Gemeinden ("Federation of Free Religious Congregations").

3. The Free Congregations Since 1858.

According to the latest revision of the Constitution (1899), the fundamental principle of the Federation is "free determination of the individual in all religious affairs according to his own advancing knowledge"; its object: "advancement of religious life independently of dogma." Since 1877, a federate convention has been held biennially. At present the entire Federation comprises probably some 22,000 souls. The largest congregations are in Berlin, Mannheim, Offenbach, and Magdeburg. The contemporary Free Congregations are unanimous in disclaiming all religion cultivated by the churches as being that of a petrified dogma-creed, but unanimous only in this negation. Indeed, a positive expression of what the advocates of free religion understand by religion can hardly be attempted, since by that very process the freedom of independent determination would be invaded, and a relapse into "confessionalism" would come to pass. But the practical problems of religious instruction, preaching, propaganda, etc., tend to press the issue in the direction of set standards of procedure. In the face of this dilemma, a varying attitude is adopted. The East Prussians, the "Königsbergers," represent the right wing within the Free Congregations; they still maintain remnants of church ideas, and religious instruction is still imparted by them in connection with the Bible. The "Nuremberg tendency" represents the opposite extreme, and stands outright upon the basis of naturalism and atheism. The center is occupied by the "South German" group, which perceives in Jesus an ethical prototype. Public worship holds only a very subordinate and accessory position. Established and generally valid forms of worship are altogether wanting; in this matter the separate congregations have their hands quite free. The Lord's Supper is still solemnized at a good many places. For baptism there had been substituted even as early as the sixties the so-called *Kindesweihe* ("infant consecration"). Since then, however, it would appear to have gone out of observance entirely. Confirmation takes place in all congregations; that is, *Jugendweihe* ("consecration of youth"), which terminates the religious instruction that begins for the most part in the ninth year of age. The movement was only transiently a momentous force in the church life of Germany; nor did it owe even this transient significance at any time to great performances, but essentially to the circumstance that people imputed great things to it, and hoped or feared them.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Kampe, *Geschichte der religiösen Bewegung der neueren Zeit*, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1852–60; Drews, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, xi. 6 (1901), 484–527; G. Tschirm, *Zur 60jährigen Geschichte der freireligiösen Bewegung*, Bamberg, 1904; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, v. § 18, Leipsic, 1906.

FREEDOM OF THE WILL. See WILL.

FREEMAN, JAMES: Pastor of the first Unitarian Church in America; b. at Charlestown, Mass., Apr. 22, 1759; d. at Newton, Mass., Nov. 14, 1835. He was educated in the public Latin school, Boston, and at Harvard College (B.A., 1777; D.D., 1811). After his graduation from college he went to Cape Cod and drilled a company of recruits for the colonial army. In 1780 he visited Quebec, where he was arrested and held till 1782. He then returned to Boston, became lay reader at King's Chapel in 1782, and pastor in 1783, but with the stipulation that he might omit the Athanasian Creed from the service. Having become a Unitarian in his views, he openly renounced the doctrine of the trinity, and in 1785 induced his church to change its liturgy, thus converting the first Episcopal Church in New England into the first Unitarian Church in America. On being refused ordination by Bishop Provost he was ordained by his own people, Nov. 18, 1787 He remained pastor of the church till 1827, though in 1826 he gave up his pastoral duties to his colleague, Francis W P Greenwood, and retired to a country residence near Boston. He published *Sermons and Addresses* (Boston, 1832), and made many contributions to periodical literature, and to the collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, of which he was one of the founders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W Ware, *American Unitarian Biography*, 2 vols., Boston, 1850–51; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, viii. 162, 9 vols., New York, 1865–73; J. H. Allen, in *American Church Hist. Series*, x. 185–186, ib. 1894.

FREEMASONS: The name of the members of a well-known secret society, derived from those medieval stonemasons who were allowed to migrate

at will, as distinguished from their fellow workmen in the gilds. The latter were restricted to certain localities and confined to their gilds, while the former went from land to land, and formed a wide-spread organization under the supervision of the supreme lodge at Strasburg. The institution of the lodge lasted longest in England, receiving a new impetus through the burning of London in 1666. Far different, however, is "symbolic freemasonry," which is a secret organization for the erection of a spiritual temple of humanity in the heart of man. The change from the ancient masonic craft to modern freemasonry began as early as the end of the sixteenth century. After the rebuilding of London and the completion of St. Paul's, the majority of lodges disappeared, but the four which survived formed a grand lodge at London on St. John's Day (June 24), 1717, surrendering manual masonry, and seeking a new sphere in moral and social life. The original organization of medieval masonic fraternity was retained, however, especially the distinction of masters, journeymen, and apprentices, as well as mutual help, the application of a detailed symbolism in words, pictures, and signs, and the solemn obligation to secrecy covering everything pertaining to the lodge. In 1721, one of the founders of this union, James Anderson, an English Presbyterian minister, drafted a "constitution" for this cosmopolitan organization, which bound all "freemasons" to a faithful observance of the moral law, humanity, and patriotism. In religion, however, they are non-sectarian, and profess only that faith in which all men of honor agree. Doctrines going beyond that are tolerated as private opinions, but no one is permitted to make propaganda for them. The characteristics of masonry are, therefore, humanistic morals, the cultivation of fraternity, and a deistic belief. It was the outcome of English deism and latitudinarianism, and was soon adopted in Germany in radical religious circles. In those Roman Catholic countries where no Protestantism existed, masonry even obtained the importance of an opposing church, and freemasonry is accordingly regarded as in league with Satan. In the encyclical *humanum genus* on freemasonry, dated Apr. 20, 1884 (2d ed., Treves, 1885), Leo XIII. solemnly condemned it, as other popes had repeatedly done since 1751.

From England masonry soon spread to the British colonies and to the continent of Europe. In 1725 it was in Paris; in 1733 in Florence and Boston; and in 1737 in Hamburg. In 1738 the Prussian crown-prince, afterward Frederick the Great, was solemnly initiated at Brunswick by a deputation from the Hamburg lodge Absalom. As king he energetically labored for the spread of the system, and in 1744 was made grand master of the grand lodge "Zu den drei Weltkugeln" in Berlin. As the tendency of masonry is essentially subjective, many internal dissensions arose. In addition to the Brotherhood of St. John, divisions were formed with a knightly organization and the most varied degrees of fantastic terminology and mysterious ceremonial. Rationalism in Germany helped to introduce masonry among the middle classes, where it still has a strong hold on account of the advantages, especially in social respects, enjoyed by many of its adherents, such as physicians and merchants. Spiritually it has not advanced. For Evangelical churches with their charitable interests, freemasonry is wholly superfluous. The Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the freemasons.

In Europe the number of masons is estimated to be over 300,000, most of them belonging to the grand lodges of Great Britain. In America, in addition to freemasons proper, who number about 750,000, there are similar societies with about 4,650,000 members, divided into Odd Fellows (820,000), Knights of Pythias (475,000), Ancient Order of United Workmen (361,000), Maccabees (244,000), Modern Workmen of America (204,000), and about twenty smaller orders, this entire body spending annually about $25,000,000 for benefit money.

PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lists of books are furnished by G. Kloss, *Bibliothek der Freimaurerei*, Frankfort (1846), Supplement by G. Findel, Leipsic, 1866, and W. Gowans, *Catalogue of Books on Freemasonry*, New York, 1858. Consult, A. G. Mackey, *Encyclopædia of Freemasonry*, Philadelphia, n.d.; idem, *Hist. of Freemasonry*, 3 parts, New York, 1900; J. O. Halliwell, *Early Hist. of Freemasonry in England*, London, 1843; C. L. Paton, *Freemasonry, its Symbolism, Religious Nature, etc.*, ib. 1873; L. Hyneman, *Hist. of Freemasonry in England*, New York, 1878; R. F. Gould, *Hist. of Freemasonry*, 6 vols., London, 1884-1887; H. Boos, *Geschichte der Freimaurerei*, Aarau, 1894; F. Katch, *Entstehung und Endzweck der Freimaurerei*, Berlin, 1897; J. Sassenbach, *Die Freimaurerei*, ib. 1897; O. Kuntzemüller, *Die Freimaurerei und ihre Gegner*, Hanover, 1897; A. Churchward, *Origin and Antiquity of Freemasonry*, London, 1898.

FREE METHODISTS. See METHODISTS, IV., 5.

FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION: An association established in Boston May 30, 1867, aiming at the emancipation of religion from sectarian limitations, the reconciliation of faiths, and the application of scientific methods to the study of religion, and emphasizing practical morality. Octavius Brooks Frothingham was the first president, and for many years Ralph Waldo Emerson was one of the vice-presidents. Members are allowed the utmost liberty of opinion. The elastic nature of the organization—"any person desiring to cooperate" is "considered a member"—renders exact statistics impossible. The association has not attempted to organize local societies, but has contented itself with holding conventions and distributing publications. An annual report is usually issued in pamphlet form.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

FREE SPIRIT, BRETHREN OF THE.

Meaning and Origin (§ 1).
Mystic Pantheism Wide-spread (§ 2).
Various Groups (§ 3).

Brethren of the Free Spirit is a name under which the heresiologists of the Middle Ages classed various extreme developments of quietistic and pantheistic mysticism. Modern scholars also have accepted the existence of a pantheistic sect, sharply marked off from the fellowship of the Church, usually recruited from the laity, and handing down

its doctrines practically unaltered from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. It is possible to show, however, that the phenomena classed under this title have points of such radical difference as to destroy the conception of one single pantheistic tradition reproducing itself through more than one century by means of an actual sect; and that the origin of this pantheistic quietistic mysticism is found not among the ordinary laity but in the monasteries and among the Beghards and Beguines, who came so strongly under monastic influence; also that in the following centuries the boundaries between monastic mysticism and sectarian pantheism were never very stable. There is no adequate ground for believing that the teachings of Amalric of Bena (q.v.) found acceptance among a section of the French Waldenses, and then about 1215 spread from eastern France into western and southern Germany. The earliest authentic information about the appearance of this sort of mysticism on German soil shows certain Swabian heretics about 1250 teaching a radical pantheism and determinism. Starting from the belief in the divine essence of the soul and of all earthly things, they considered the ascension of the soul to God the goal of all religion. This was to be attained by abstraction from all earthly activity and also from moral and religious commandments which distracted the soul from its purpose of union with the Godhead. The "perfect man" who has reached this goal is sinless; his will is God's will; the Church's laws and means of grace are without significance for him. All value was taken both from moral effort and from ecclesiastical ordinances by the belief that every human act had been predestined from eternity. All this points to these doctrines being a straggling offshoot of the monastic mysticism of the school of Saint-Victor, as drawn by its adherents from Dionysius the Areopagite. When Richard of Saint-Victor (q.v.) says of the soul united with God (*De prepar. animi ad contempl.*, ii. 13) "Here first the soul recovers its ancient dignity, and asserts its claim to the innate glory of its own freedom," he uses expressions only too easily misunderstood by extravagant mystics, and serving them as a foundation for their doctrine of spiritual freedom.

1. Meaning and Origin.

The decrees of the Council of Vienne (1311) against the Beguines and Beghards shows that the church authorities of that time were disposed to tax these communities throughout Germany with similar pantheistic heresies. The consequences of this view have been that up to the present day it has been usual to attribute a much wider extension than the facts justify to the pantheistic doctrines, and to consider the characteristics of the orthodox Beguines and Beghards, e.g., their esteem for poverty and mendicancy, as distinguishing the heretical mystics. The fact is, however, that it is difficult to draw a sharp line of demarcation between orthodox and heretical mysticism. How true this is may be seen not only from the complaint of David of Augsburg that the friends of mysticism were persecuted on no other ground than as heretics or as possessed by demons, but also from the accusations of spreading alleged heresies which were brought against Tauler, Suso, and Ruysbroeck, to say nothing of Eckhart. Among the cloistered women of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the line of demarcation was even more fluctuating. The ecstatic-mystical life and the visionary condition of many of them produces frequent expressions from which to pantheism is but a short step. It can scarcely be denied that this pantheism won many adherents through the influence of the great German mystics of the fourteenth century. The theory that close personal relations existed between Eckhart and the "Free Spirit" heretics at Strasburg and Cologne is unproved and unlikely; but the sectarian pantheistic mysticism was unquestionably aided and influenced by his speculations. In a well-known passage of Suso's *Büchlein der Wahrheit* (ch. vi.), in which he is arguing with the leaders of the pantheistic mystics, the latter quote Eckhart as a high authority. This attempt to show him as on their side, however unjustifiable, throws light on the close correspondence between the propositions condemned as his by John XXII. in 1329 and the extracts given by Mosheim from a lost sectarian book *De novem rupibus;* apparently the papal censure was based not upon Eckhart's authentic writings but upon this pantheistic treatise which was given out as his.

2. Mystic Pantheism Wide-spread.

The opponents of the teaching of the "Free Spirit," e.g. Tauler, Rulman Merswin, Gerson, Ruysbroeck, and Geert Groote, give the impression that they are combating, not an organized sect, but a morbid tendency and an exaggeration of mystical piety. The confusion frequently found in writers of that period between the adherents of this pantheistic mysticism and the Fraticelli and Apostolic Brethren springs partly from ignorance of the points in which they differed widely, and partly from the use of the expression "secta spiritus libertatis" as a common designation for quite distinct heresies. This has led some modern writers into the supposition that the teachings of the German heretical mystics had been spread in the fourteenth century among the Italian Fraticelli and Apostolicals, as well as through the so-called "Turlupins" (q.v.), in France. It is clear that the attempt to trace the development and organization of a single definite pantheistic sect in the Middle Ages must be unsuccessful. The records of the tribunals, however, make us acquainted with various groups of this kind and with a whole series of individual representatives of heretical mysticism. The condemnation of Margareta Porete, a Beguine of Hainault, who was executed in Paris in 1316, precedes the Council of Vienne. In her writings the soul, "annihilated" in God, is released from the obligation to practise virtue, which, however, comes naturally to the soul united with God. Probably similar to hers was the teaching of the mystical work of Marie de Valenciennes, controverted by Gerson, which, appealing to an alleged Biblical counsel "Ama et fac quod vis," denied

3. Various Groups.

the binding force of the moral law for those who were filled with the mystical love of God. With the Flemish poetess and visionary Hadewich Blommaerdine (q.v.), the pantheistic element is not prominent. About the same time in Cologne, a Netherlander, Walther, burned c. 1322, was the center of a wide-spread pantheistic movement, in the contemporary descriptions of which we meet for the first time with the nocturnal Adamite orgies (see ADAMITES). In southern Germany Berthold of Rorbach (q.v.), burned 1356 at Speyer, and Hermann Küchener of Nuremberg, who recanted at Würzburg in 1342, were the apostles of a similar movement. Another interesting group is that of the "Friends of God" (q.v.), whose leader, Nicholas of Basel was burned at Vienna in 1396. Pantheistic-antinomian elements are mingled with apocalyptic views of the Joachim type in the "Homines intelligentiæ" (q.v.). The sources for the history of these heresies in the fifteenth century are so confused that little can be made of them. That pantheistic ideas still had power in the Reformation period is shown by the rise of the Loist sect at Antwerp (1525–1545), and the Libertine or Spiritual party (see LIBERTINES, 3) which after 1529 spread from the Netherlands through France, western Germany, and Switzerland, as well as by certain developments of the Anabaptist movement.

(HERMAN HAUPT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: P. Fredericq, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis Neerlandicæ*, vols. i.–ii., Ghent, 1889–96; Ulanowski, in *Scriptores rerum Polonicarum*, xiii. 233–250, Cracow, 1889. Consult: H. C. Lea, *Hist. of Inquisition*, vol. ii., passim, New York, 1888; C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, ii. 470, Stuttgart, 1847; J. C. L. Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, II. ii. 642 sqq., Bonn, 1849, Eng. transl., ed. H. B. Smith, ii. 590 sqq., New York, 1871; W. Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland*, II., iii. 59 sqq., Utrecht, 1869; W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik*, vols. i.–iii., Leipsic, 1874–93; H. Haupt, *ZKG*, v. 478, vii. 503, xii. 35; H. Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung*, ii. 240 sqq., Berlin, 1877; W. Wattenbach, in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1887, pp. 517 sqq.; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Sektengeschichte*, ii. 378 sqq., 702 sqq., Munich, 1890; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 633, v. 393, 401, 408.

FREETHINKER: In general, one who reaches his conclusions by following the demands of reason, rather than those of authority; more particularly, one who rejects the supernatural elements of Christianity. The term was first used toward the close of the seventeenth century, though it does not seem to have gained general currency till after the publication of Anthony Collins' *Discourse of Freethinking* (1713, see COLLINS, ANTHONY). The term then came to be applied specifically to the group of deistic writers formed by Collins, Woolston, Tindal, and others (see DEISM). Although Collins defined freethinking as merely an attempt to judge a proposition according to the weight of evidence, his book was regarded as an attack on the fundamental tenets of Christianity; and from that day to this the term freethinker has carried with it, in the popular understanding, the implication of skeptic, infidel, and even libertine and atheist. The freethinker of to-day does not reject Christianity; he explains it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under ANTITRINITARIANISM; DEISM.

FREE-WILL BAPTISTS. See BAPTISTS, II., 4, *c*.

FREISING, BISHOPRIC OF: A bishopric organized by Boniface in the spring of 739 after his return from Rome, with the other Bavarian bishoprics, under the approval of Duke Odilo. It was of small extent; the boundary joined Augsburg on the west, ran to the south along the ridge of the hills on the north side of the Inn valley, then along the top of the Mangfall range, and touched the river at the present Kufstein, following its course to Gars, where it turned to the north and came round to meet the Augsburg line again above Geisenfeld. In charge of it Boniface placed Erimbert, brother of Corbinian (q.v.). The number of monasterics it contained was large. The most important of them was that of St. Quirinus on the Tegernsee, which goes back probably to the reign of King Pepin, and asserted its immediate dependence on the Empire until the time of Louis the Bavarian. (A. HAUCK.)

The history of the diocese presents few features of more than local interest up to the Reformation, in which period it must be said that the preservation of Bavaria to the Roman Catholic faith is due rather to the zeal of the dukes than to the influence of the bishops. Both, however, were not unwilling to show a reasonable spirit, and the Synod of Salzburg in 1562, including Bishop Maurice von Sandizell of Freising (1559–66), assented to the laying before the Council of Trent of the concessions desired by Duke Albert V. of Bavaria and the Emperor Ferdinand—the marriage of the clergy and communion in both kinds. The next bishop, Ernest (1566–1612), was himself of the ducal family, which gave the see two more bishops, Albert Sigmund (1652–85) and John Theodore (1727–63). The title of prince-bishop was conferred by Ferdinand II. upon the incumbents of the see. By the secularization of 1802–03 Freising was incorporated as a principality with the Bavarian Palatinate, except the portions situated in Austria and the Tyrol, which were given to Salzburg. By the concordat of 1817 a combined archbishopric of Munich and Freising took the place of the old bishopric (see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, VI., 2, § 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Meichelbeck, *Hist. Frisingensis*, 2 vols., Augsburg, 1724–29; Graf Hundt, in *AMA*, vols. xii.–xiii.; K. Roth, *Kozrohs Renner*, Munich, 1854; idem, *Verzeichnis der Freisinger Urkunden*, ib. 1855; idem, *Oertlichkeiten des Bisthums Freising*, ib. 1856; S. Riezler, *Geschichte Bayerns*, Gotha, 1880; H. G. Gengler, *Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte Bayerns*, i. 58, 185 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 257; Hauck, *KD*, i. 491.

FRELINGHUYSEN, frî'ling-hoi"zen, **THEODORE:** Dutch Reformed educator; b. at Millstone, N. J., Mar. 28, 1787; d. at New Brunswick, N. J., Apr. 12, 1862. After his graduation (1804) from the College of New Jersey (Princeton) he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1808, when he removed to Newark. He was attorney-general of New Jersey 1817–29, United States senator 1829–45, mayor of Newark 1837–38, chancellor of New York University 1839–50, and president of Rutgers College 1850–62. In 1844 he was the Whig candidate for the vice-presidency, on the ticket with Henry Clay. In the senate he won for

himself the title of "Christian statesman." It is said that no other American layman was ever associated with so many great religious and charitable enterprises. He was president of the American Bible Society 1846–62, of the American Tract Society 1842–48, and for sixteen years president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He was vice-president of the American Sunday-school Union 1826–61, and for many years was vice-president of the American Colonization Society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. W. Chambers, *Memoir of Theodore Frelinghuysen*, New York, 1863.

FREMANTLE, WILLIAM HENRY: Dean of Ripon; b. at Swanbourne (17 m. n.e. of Oxford), Buckinghamshire, Dec. 12, 1831. He studied at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1853), and was ordered deacon in 1855 and ordained priest in 1856. He was fellow of All Souls, Oxford, 1854–63 and fellow of Balliol and tutor 1883–94. He was curate of Middle Claydon, 1855–57, vicar of Lewknor, Oxfordshire, 1857–65, rector of St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, London, 1865–83, and canon of Canterbury 1882–95. Since 1895 he has been dean of Ripon. He was chaplain to Bishop and Archbishop Tait 1861–82, select preacher to the University of Oxford in 1879–80, Bampton Lecturer in 1883, and William Belden Noble Lecturer at Harvard University in 1900. He has written *The Influence of Commerce on Christianity* (London, 1854); *Lay Power in Parishes* (1869); *The Ecclesiastical Judgments of the Privy Council* (in collaboration with G. C. Brodrick; 1865); *Reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ* (1870); *The Gospel of the Secular Life* (university sermons; 1882); *The World as the Subject of Redemption* (Bampton Lectures; 1885); *Eighty-Eights: Sermons on Armada and Revolution* (1888); *The Present Work of the Anglican Communion* (1888); and *Christian Ordinances and Social Progress* (Noble lectures for 1900; Boston, 1901). He also translated the works of St. Jerome and Rufinus in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (in collaboration with G. Lewis and W. G. Martley; Edinburgh, 1893), and edited *Church Reform* (London, 1888) and the *Sermons* of B. Jowett (3 vols., 1895–1901).

FRENCH CONFESSION OF FAITH. See GALLICAN CONFESSION.

FRENCH PROPHETS: A fanatical sect in England started in 1706 by refugee Camisards (q.v.), who pretended to have the gift of prophecy and the power of working miracles. Their special mission, they claimed, was to declare the speedy establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, which was to be accompanied by wonders and the infliction of severe judgments on the wicked. For a time they produced a deep impression in London and the larger provincial cities and won the allegiance of such well-known people as Lady Jane Forbes, Sir Richard Bulkeley, and John Lacy. Bulkeley claimed to have been miraculously cured of continuous headache, stone, and rupture, and contributed large sums to the support of the sect, at the time of his death (1710) he was on the point of selling his estates and distributing the proceeds among the prophets. He wrote in their defense, *An Answer to Several Treatises Lately Published on the Subject of the Prophets* (London, 1708).

Lacy, who was a member of Edmund Calamy's church, fell under the influence of the prophets soon after their arrival and "entered into all their absurdities, except that of a community of goods, to which he strongly objected, having an income of two thousand pounds per annum." He became a seer and healer and published several works for the cause, including *A Cry from the Desert, or Testimonials of Miraculous Things Lately Come to Pass in the Cevennes* (London, 1707), a translation from the French of Francis Maximilian; *Prophetical Warnings of Elias Marion* (1707); *The Prophetical Warnings of John Lacy* (1707), a collection of his own prophecies; *A Relation of the Dealings of God to his Unworthy Servant, John Lacy* (1708), an answer to an attack by Edmund Calamy; and *A Vision of J. L., Esq., a Prophet* (1715), inspired by the Jacobite rising. In 1707 the prophets were convicted of publishing false and scandalous pamphlets and holding tumultuous assemblies and placed in the pillory, though prosecutions against Lacy and Bulkeley were quashed. This seems to have made the sect temporarily more popular than ever, and soon there were no less than 400 persons spreading their fanatical prophecies in various parts of the country. They even went so far as to predict that one of their number, Thomas Emes, lately deceased, would rise from the dead on May 25, 1708. In a pamphlet entitled *The Mighty Miracle, or the Wonder of Wonders*, Lacy issued a general invitation to everybody to come to Bunhill Fields to witness this event. The failure of Emes to emerge from his grave at the time appointed weakened the influence of the prophets, and from that time they fell into disgrace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. Hughson [pseudonym for Edward Pugh], *A Copious Account of the French and English Prophets*, London, 1814; R. Adams, *The Religious World Displayed*, Edinburgh, 1809; *English Review*, ix (1852), 22–23; and especially *DNB*, xxxi. 382–383, where a copious literature on the subject is indicated.

FRENCH REVOLUTION, RELIGIOUS EFFECTS OF.

Early Friendly Attitude of the Church (§ 1).
Influence of Financial Considerations (§ 2).
Reconstitution of Church and Clergy (§ 3).
Clerical Opposition Causes Persecution (§4).
More Extreme Anticlerical Measures (§ 5).
Movement Becomes Antireligious (§ 6).
Rationalistic Cults Introduced (§ 7).
The Turn in Affairs (§ 8).
The Coming of Napoleon (§ 9).

The violent commotion which, toward the end of the eighteenth century, shattered the vital structure of the French state was directed primarily against medieval feudalism. But, inasmuch as this was closely related to the Roman Catholic Church, the element of destruction of necessity reached the Church. From this it was an easy step to the attack upon religion in general. Distrust of the positive teaching of the Church and the frivolity which was hampered by

1. Early Friendly Attitude of the Church.

the moral philosophy of the day combined to arouse the suspicion that the clergy clung to their prerogatives, social organization, and possessions not because of their conviction of the essential rightness of these things, but simply from a desire for power. As financial stringency had given the first impulse to the revolution, so later it seemed just and natural to make use of the wealth of the Church to save the State from bankruptcy. But from the beginning the political status of the clergy was a matter of consideration. It was commonly expected that they as a body would side with the nobility; but while the nobility maintained their purpose to contend for their ascendancy in the assembly, on June 22, 1789, 148 of the 308 clerical delegates sided with the third estate, and on June 24, 151 others joined in the movement under the leadership of Talleyrand. The abolition of tithes aroused little opposition; already the clergy had offered their possessions for the national good; and the proposal to use the church vessels for public relief had been agreed to, while the offer of 140 million francs was accepted by the assembly Sept. 29. But the advancing revolutionary spirit was no longer satisfied with a friendly attitude on the part of the Church; it would satisfy its hate by appropriating all the Church's possessions. It is therefore noteworthy that a high dignitary of the Church, Talleyrand, bishop of Autun, recognizing that the especial prerogatives of the Church could no longer be preserved, lent his aid to the expression of the general feeling. He proposed, Oct. 10, 1789, that a third of the ecclesiastical revenue (fifty millions of francs) be applied to cover the deficit in the accounts of the State, justifying the proposal by the fact that the clergy were not owners of the Church property, but merely in possession of a usufruct, while the State had power over every institution within its jurisdiction. Talleyrand, Mirabeau, and Abbé Grégoire carried their point against the opposition of Sieyès and the Abbés Maury, Montesquieu, and others, by a vote of 586 to 346. A resolution passed reciting that all ecclesiastical property was at the disposal of the State on the condition that the latter defray the expenses of public worship and provide for the support of the Church's officers and for the maintenance of the poor. Two days later this was ratified by the king while in confinement. Yet the clergy, so far from receiving sympathy, were the recipients of ridicule and insults from the populace.

2. Influence of Financial Considerations.

New plans against the clergy came continually to the front, personal attacks were made upon the church dignitaries, while the monasteries were especial objects of assault. On Feb. 11, 1790, Treilhard proposed for the second time the abolition of monasteries and of monastic vows. After many debates the resolution passed on Feb. 13, 1790, dissolving all orders and congregations of both sexes with the exception of those devoted to the instruction of children and to the care of the sick. Monastics might leave their cloisters on notifying the local authorities; monks who were unwilling to leave were assigned houses for their use. Great numbers seized the freedom offered and became most enthusiastic in their devotion to the revolution. Nuns were allowed to remain where they were, and few left their orders. Pensions were granted to those who entered civil life, depending in amount upon the condition of the monastery, the rule of the order, and the age of the individuals. The clergy had hoped that the resolution to sell the property of the Church would be a dead letter, but the lack of gold and the growing deficit made this measure an immediate eventuality. The archbishop of Aix proposed a loan of 400 millions of francs, guaranteed by the property of the clergy, who would pay the interest and then gradually the principal through the proceedings from sales. But the majority would not accept this plan, not recognizing the position of the clergy which could warrant the offering of such a sum. Meanwhile, Dom Gerles, a member of the clerical committee, urged that, in order to satisfy those who feared for the existence of religion, the Roman Catholic religion be regarded as that of the nation, and that its services alone be regarded as authorized by the State. After considerable debate the assembly decided not to entertain the proposal, since it was neither willing nor able to enter decrees upon matters of religion (Apr. 13, 1790). The Paris chapter, the members of the Right, and the cities of Nîmes, Nantes, and Rennes complained against this decision and defended the Roman Catholic religion. The assembly determined to assume administration of the clerical estates under the directors of departments and districts, 400 millions to be paid therefor and the money to be given to the clergy.

3. Reconstitution of Church and Clergy.

Behind the financial gain which the people thought to make on this occasion lay the main purpose, the dissolution of a detested yet powerful aristocratic body. The clergy was regarded as the corner-stone of the feudal system, the demolition of which was the goal of the whole political movement. Several other moves followed the completion of the change in the status of the clergy. The number of bishoprics was reduced from 134 to 83. The bishop became the immediate pastor of the community in which he lived, and instead of the former chapter had a number of vicars who formed his council and gave him advice in all matters. The bishops were chosen by the same bodies as named the members of the departmental assemblies, and were forbidden to seek papal confirmation. The choice of the pastor was left to the active citizens of each district, but he was inducted into his post by the bishop. Bishops and pastors took the oath of allegiance to the nation, the law, the king, and the constitution. These changes, concluded May 31, followed a severe struggle led on the part of the clergy by the archbishop of Aix and the Jansenist theologian Camus. The civil constitution of the clergy was finished July 12, the salaries being fixed as follows: the archbishop of Paris, 50,000 livres; the other bishops, 20,000; the vicars, 2,000 to 6,000; and the pastors, 1,200 to 4,000, with dwelling and garden. The king, being urged to sign this constitution, found himself in difficulties, and wrote the pope for advice. The latter could no better solve the problem, called a meeting of car-

dinals, and asked the king to await the result of their deliberations. But the aspect of the people and assembly was so threatening that the king signed Aug. 24, 1790, though the pope and the bishops began a passive resistance. Protests from all quarters came in, the leading one by Boisgelin, archbishop of Aix, who voiced the feelings of the Church and its opposition to the new constitution in a paper under the title *Exposition des principes*, signed by 110 bishops. The assembly, regarding this as a revolutionary movement, replied by a decree of Nov. 27, 1790, requiring all bishops to take the oath of obedience to the civil constitution of the clergy, and threatening those who resisted with dismissal from their posts. At the suggestion of the king, Boisgelin, in the hope of securing some concessions, presented to the pope a paper to the following purport: it suggested (1) that the pope confirm the arrangement made by the assembly for the metropolitan and other dioceses; (2) that the bishops who were deprived of sees or whose dominion was limited be advised to approve the new divisions; (3) that he give his sanction to the establishment of the new dioceses; (4) that he give the metropolitan power in the matter of canonical investiture of the new bishoprics; (5) that he approve of the arrangement for a council of vicars for the conduct of parochial business; and (6) that he admonish the bishops to accept the transfer of the vacant parishes to the incumbents chosen by the people in case there were neither moral nor canonical reasons against it. The archbishop did not expect that the pope would assent to these propositions, yet he laid them before him, while the latter took refuge in procrastination. Meanwhile the king was driven to sign the threatening decree, Dec. 26, 1791, and on the next day Abbé Grégoire took the oath of allegiance, and was at once followed by Talleyrand and three other bishops and by seventy-one of the 300 clerical members of the assembly. It was the purpose of the assembly to have the new Church free from the authority of the pope.

4. Clerical Opposition Causes Persecution.

Jan. 4, 1792, was the day set for the general administration of the oath. It was a day of great bitterness of feeling in the assembly, but the majority of the clergy of Paris took the oath; in the provinces three-fourths of the clergy remained true to the old order. These consecutive steps against the clergy had created a great stir among the French people. The nobility and those who, from the circumstance of birth or of civil or political position, were hostile to the new order joined with the clergy who were opposed to the constitution. The king, realizing his position, began to think of flight and of retaliation with outside aid. The assembly, on the other hand, saw itself checked by the very extreme to which it had been carried. In the South there were rumors of an insurrectionary movement; the large number of those deprived of positions was itself a cause for grave apprehension, and it was not due to thoughts of charity that pensions were provided for these and further persecution checked. While the Roman Catholic clergy were lamenting the dissolution of their church, Protestants were enjoying their newly found liberty as granted by the new civil constitution. The latter thus became the friends of the revolution, their clergymen taking the oath without hesitation. The pope at last broke his silence, announcing his absolute rejection of the civil constitution. The first declaration was in a document sent to the archbishop of Sens, threatening him with degradation from the cardinalate unless he formally retracted the oath of allegiance to the constitution. The archbishop replied by sending his cardinal's hat to the pope, but declared his intention to remain as bishop at the head of his church. The pope expressed his condemnation of the civil constitution in other acts. He wrote on Mar. 30 to the thirty bishops who had joined in the memorial of the archbishop of Aix in the *Exposition des principes*, and threatened them with canonical punishment in case of failure on their part to retract their oath of obedience to the constitution. In other letters he declared all arrangements made in accordance with the constitution null and void; he commanded all clergymen who had taken the oath to retract within forty days under penalty of permanent suspension, and warned the people to have no dealings with the prelates or pastors who had been forcibly installed. These letters afforded a new basis for the opposition of the bishops and clergy, and many withdrew their oaths. But the very zeal of reaction aroused again hatred for the clergy, Church, and religion. The pope became the object of insult, and on May 4, the day after his letters had been made public, he was burned in effigy before the palace with the applause of the populace. The bishops were driven from their diocese partly by direct command of government, partly by turbulent violence. Talleyrand resigned his bishopric and returned to private life. The churches of the resisting bishops were closed or put to other than religious use. At this juncture the clergy began to break away from celibacy, and this the assembly encouraged, promising to pay the pensions and declaring that there was no law forbidding the marriage of the clergy. In later times of persecution those who had married found their marriage state a protection, as it signified that the priest had discarded his ecclesiastical relationships. The opposing clergy avoided this step, and the upholders of royalty regarded it a duty of honor to seek the sacraments from these only. The king's vain attempt at flight in June, 1791, became a new pretext for persecution of the clergy, and this in Nantes was carried to extremes. The suspicion that the clergy had been connected with this unfortunate attempt was strengthened by a letter of July 7 from the pope to the king, expressing the pope's high hope of the king's speedy and victorious return to Paris, clothed with full authority and surrounded by the regular bishops, who would then be able to return to their respective dioceses. This letter fell into the hands of the revolutionists. The immediate results were more severe regulations against the disobedient clergy, and the union of Avignon and the county of Venaissin to France, Sept. 14. Reports of conditions in Vendée and Montpellier, as well as from other parts of the country, aroused a new hatred of

the Church, which was shown in a decree of the assembly, Nov. 29. Priests who had not taken the oath were given eight days' grace in which to take the oath of citizenship; all failing then to do this were to be deprived of their pensions, were to be considered as under suspicion, and were liable to imprisonment; if they were found in a place where trouble occurred, in case this was due to religious causes, they might be removed from the place. The government of each department was charged with the carrying out of these regulations and was to report to the assembly in case further measures were required.

5. More Extreme Anticlerical Measures.

The opposing clergy in Paris, as well as the directorium of Paris, urged the king to veto this bill, which he did on Dec. 19, 1791, moved also by regret at signing the previous bills. Now a storm of indignation broke out against the king and monarchical institutions: he was called a traitor and the ally of internal and external foes, whose sanction of the laws was not needed. While the resolution of Nov. 29 had not the force of law, proceedings took place in many departments—Toulouse, Nantes, Rennes, Angers—which assumed its binding force, and the nonjuring priests were maltreated and cast into prison. The hate which first was directed against the priests was now turned against the Roman Catholic Church and against religion itself, as was particularly the case in the Jacobin club. Nevertheless, though many showed themselves atheists, the attitude taken by Robespierre indicated plainly that the revolution was not wholly under antireligious influence. Robespierre expressed himself thus: "To call upon divine Providence, not to be willing to lose sight of the idea of the divine Being who influences so essentially the affairs of nations, who appears to me to be in particular watching over the French Revolution—and this last does not appear to me to be too bold a thought—all this is for me a necessity. How could I, relying upon my own spirit alone, have endured all these conflicts which call for more than human strength, had I not raised my soul to God?" On Apr. 28 a law was passed abolishing clerical dress, and on May 27 a bill went through directing that at the request of twenty active citizens of a canton the directors of a department should see to the deposition of nonjuring priests as instigators of sedition. The apparent justification of this law lay in the fact that there were rumors at the time of the suppression of a conspiracy in the department of Tarn to kill the Calvinists of that locality. The king delayed ratifying this bill, and indeed finally interposed his veto, a deed which by no means bettered the condition of the priests or enhanced the security of his throne. At first the means of deportation of the priests failed, yet in Lyons, Châlons, Angers, Nantes, and Dijon there were numerous arrests of priests. On Aug. 10 began the close confinement of the king, while the extreme party gained the ascendancy in the assembly. On Aug. 23 a bill passed commanding all nonjuring priests to leave France within fourteen days under penalty of being sent to Guiana. Then came the dark month of September in which so many priests were slain. Many were brought to Paris to be deported, and on the way to the place of detention in the city eighteen were killed by the mob and sixty more in the courtyard, while later in the monastery of the Carmelites 200 were killed. As a consequence the priests delayed no longer in obeying the law to leave the country, finding refuge in the papal dominions in Switzerland, in the Netherlands, and in Spain. In consequence of this law 40,000 priests were expatriated, and in Protestant England 8,000 found a home.

6. Movement Becomes Antireligious.

The next attack was upon institutions which connected civil life and Christianity. A decree of Sept. 20, 1792, transferred the registry of births, marriages, and deaths from the Church to the civil authorities. Only a few days earlier, Aug. 30, divorce was made possible by simple declaration only, and on Sept. 20, by common agreement; already for Protestants declaration before a judge had constituted legal marriage. The calendar was changed at this time. Since Sept. 22 they had reckoned from the first year of the republic; on Oct. 5, 1793, an entirely new calendar was devised in which each of the twelve months was divided into three decades, the first of each decade of days taking the place of the Christian Sunday. The five surplus days of the year were made a festal period. The names of the days were taken from natural products of the soil and the like. The national convention which succeeded the national assembly on Sept. 21, 1792, assumed an attitude still more inimical to Christianity. At the instigation of Chaumette, a noted despiser of religion, the Christmas festival was abolished and in its place was installed the "feast of the sansculottes." Attacks upon church rites, dignities and feasts were numerous, and atheistic declarations were frequent. In its earlier days the convention was milder in its dealings with the clergy, declaring the outrages against them punishable. But the harsher side came to be seen before long. Some of the school-children, of course prompted to this course, asked that they be not made to pray in the name of a so-called God, but that they be given instruction in the fundamentals of equality, the rights of mankind, and the constitution; but at the time this petition met with rebuff. Toward the end of the year 1793 atheistic fanaticism gained ascendancy, and on Nov. 1 a delegation from Nantes petitioned for the abolition of Roman Catholic services. On Nov. 7, after the reading of a letter to the convention, beginning: "I am a priest, that is, a charlatan," Gobel, the archbishop of Paris, went to the president's desk and laid his letter of appointment to the post upon the table, saying amid great applause that the will of the people had been his first law, and that from this time on there could be no national worship except that of freedom and equality; he renounced his position as a servant of the Roman Catholic Church. He received congratulations from the president of the convention, and then laid aside his red cap, his cross, and his ring, and his vicars also deposited there the insignia of their offices. But this unworthy act brought Gobel no safety, since five months later he ascended the scaffold on the charge

of aiding in the destruction of morals. In the scene just portrayed a Protestant minister took part—Julien, of Toulouse, declaring that Protestantism also had its charlatanry, and that henceforth he would have no other sanctuary than that of the law, no deity than freedom, no Gospel than the republican constitution. He died at the guillotine in Apr., 1794. Bishop Grégoire was the only ecclesiastic of the convention to oppose this unworthy movement. His stand was bold and his declaration emphatic that his religion was a part of his most solemn convictions; his office was from the hands of the people, but his call to it came neither from the people nor the convention. He was violently assailed, but remained steadfast, continued to wear ecclesiastical dress, and presented so imposing a mien that no one ventured to lay hands upon him.

7. Rationalistic Cults Introduced.

The Paris council instituted, in celebration of the abolition of the Roman Catholic religion, a feast of reason, carried out on the twentieth of Brumaire (Nov. 10), 1793, in Notre Dame, in which a so-called temple of philosophy was erected, in which sat as the representative of reason an opera singer, Mademoiselle Maillard. The celebration was continued in the national convention, whither the representative of reason was carried in a sedan-chair, was proclaimed goddess of the feast, of freedom, and reason. The procession then went again to the cathedral, where the celebration was held and hymns were sung to reason. This ceremony was imitated in other parts of the country, the sanction of the convention having been given to the new cult of reason. On Nov. 13 the subordinates of the convention were empowered to receive the renouncements of the clergy and the latter were urged to abjure Christianity. In the festivals the churches were often plundered and the treasures appropriated as state property. Proposals were made to destroy the towers which held the bells and the sculptures of Notre Dame on the ground that they implicitly opposed equality. The convention received reports from various quarters of the burial of Christianity and the abolition of the worship of God. In cases where the clergy submitted to the demands made upon them, the fact was noted and celebrated as the triumph of philosophy over prejudice and error, while the churches were stripped of adornment and turned into temples of reason or even put to ignominious uses. Books of prayer or hymns were burned, the citizens were forbidden to keep Sunday as a holy day, while on Nov. 22 all bishops and clergy who had renounced their functions were assured of pensions. In spite of all this there were many, especially women, who still went to the churches for prayer and worship. Even in the convention the voice of Robespierre was raised against the prevalent tendency, and on Nov. 21 at the Jacobins' club he declaimed against Hébert, who had just delivered a harangue upon the dangers of fanaticism and priesthood. He declared that there were men who under the pretense of destroying superstition made a sort of religion of atheism. This might do for aristocrats, but the people needed a Supreme Being to watch over oppressed innocence and to punish victorious crime. But the representatives of atheism were not to be overthrown without a struggle. A few days later they put through the city council a decree to close the churches and making ot all who contraverted this suspicious persons.

8. The Turn in Affairs.

Chaumette, however, secured a partial recall of this resolution, and on Nov. 26 Danton carried the resolution in the convention that the antireligious masquerades should cease and that an end be put to the persecution of the priests, while no obstacle was to be laid in the way of any worship, the decree for freedom of worship passing the convention on Dec. 6. Robespierre began to pose as the patron of religion; and though he was far from desiring to give to the priests their earlier power, declaring them to be in religion what charlatans were in medicine and that the true priest of the Highest Being was nature, whose temple was the universe and his worship virtue, yet he prevailed upon the convention, May 7, 1794, to make the following declaration: The French people acknowledges the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul; it recognizes that the worthy worship of him is the fulfilment of man's duties, the first of which are the detestation of faithlessness and tyranny, the punishment of tyrants and traitors, and the support of the unhappy; festivals shall be appointed with the object of bringing mankind again to the thought of the deity. The first of the festivals provided for was celebrated June 8, 1794, at which Robespierre, then president of the convention, appeared in gay costume and delivered a political-moral address. Though shortly after Robespierre went to the scaffold charged with making for himself a priesthood, his speeches marked the turning-point in favor toward religious belief. On May 30, 1795, the use of the churches was granted to their former possessors, though the public announcement of service, as by the ringing of bells, was forbidden. The constitution of Aug. 22, 1795, granted freedom in matters of religion to all who submitted to the law. Oversight by regular authorities was provided for, the clergy was forbidden to interfere in the matter of the registry of vital statistics and to publish foreign documents hostile to the republic. The last was aimed against the pope, who by rescripts was continually endeavoring to control the French Church. Full freedom was given to the rearing of religious sects, and owing to this was a remarkable development of "Theophilanthropists," which reduced all religious teaching to the doctrines of God and of immortality and the moral ideas which flowed from them. The dispersal of these sects caused no little trouble later when Napoleon, after the signing of the concordat (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, VI., §§ 1–2), forbade their meetings, especially those of the Theophilanthropists, whose sect had spread widely over France. Even after the decree of 1795 the persecutions of religion did not entirely cease. In Oct., 1795, the convention threatened with death all exiled clergy if they returned to France. But the lot of the religious was making advance toward betterment during the year 1796 and the first part of 1797.

On June 17 Camille Jordan, deputy from Lyons, delivered an address in favor of the priests and calling for a revision of the laws respecting religion. On June 24 the directorium reported to the Five Hundred that, in consequence of the more favorable outlook in religious affairs, a large number of priests had returned and many religious organizations were asking freedom of worship. Finally a decree was passed to restore to the priests their civil rights, though in September of 1797, during a temporary period of control by the republican radicals, persecution of the priests was renewed, and of the returned priests stern requirements were made, such as vowing hatred to royalty. Under these conditions many of the exiled clergy returned, and about 17,000 took the required oath; but others were exiled, and about 380 transported to Guiana, while others died miserably on the islands of Oleron and Rhée.

9. The Coming of Napoleon.

The return of Napoleon from Egypt gave to the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church a favorable turn; the imprisoned ecclesiastics were released, and freedom of worship was proclaimed (Dec. 28, 1799). The services of the Church were no longer confined to the first day of each decade, and the only requirement of the clergy was that they declare their submission to the law and the constitution of 1799, while the festivals of the Revolution were reduced to two. Bonaparte, believing the assistance of the Church essential in establishing his power, opened negotiations with Pius VII., and on Apr. 18, 1801, a solemn service was performed in Notre Dame. In spite of the strong hold unbelief had gained in France during the Revolution, 40,000 communities shortly returned to the Roman Catholic Church. A great difficulty arose in this restoration of the Church owing to the split in the ranks of the clergy over the oaths imposed by law. The nonjuring clergy considered themselves the only true representatives of the Church; on the other hand, the constitutional priests maintained that their attitude of yielding had saved its existence, thereby rendering the greater service. Napoleon at first was drawn toward the side of the nonjuring priests, since they seemed to be held in higher esteem by the people. Then he attempted to aid Bishop Grégoire, the head of the constitutional clergy, to secure reconciliation. But he soon saw that neither the pope nor the nonjuring priests would have anything to do with the constitutional clergy, and won the support of the nonjuring element by concluding a concordat with the pope in 1801 against the advice of Grégoire. Since in the concordat no mention was made of the Protestants, and the first article seemed to make the Roman Catholic cultus the one having principal rights, a special statement of Mar. 9, 1802, declared that the other churches were to enjoy equal rights with the Roman Catholic, it being the duty of the State to protect the noble-minded Protestant minority, which had many claims upon the respect and favor of the nation. Three months were allowed for the organization of the different ecclesiastical bodies. The ratification of the concordat could not be accomplished so quickly, however, there being many obstacles in the way. Many of the constitutional and of the nonjuring clergy, and some statesmen also, were opposed to the proposed restoration of the churches. A difficult part of the work lay in getting the bishops to lay down their offices. The pope, however, in Oct., 1801, directed both classes of clergy to lay down their offices, and was obeyed by all, even the exiled, except those in England. Bonaparte found opposition also among the political forces, the senate, the tribunal, and the legislature, and he had to use his constitutional right to reduce the membership of the tribunal before introducing the concordat. The concordat itself needed a "constructive" article defining the public policy of worship according to the principles of the document itself. This article, assuring to every religion the sufferance and protection of the State, was presented to the council Apr., 1802. According to it, without the permission of the government no bulls or briefs might be published nor any councils held; every priest was to acknowledge "Bossuet's declaration" of 1682 and promise obedience to the Church in spiritual matters and to the civil power in temporal affairs; the bishops, appointed by the First Consul and confirmed by the pope, were allowed to name their pastors, provided they sought civil approval before installing them; they might build churches and seminaries, but in the choice of teachers the confirmation of government was necessary, and the pupils might not become priests before their twenty-fifth year; the new archbishoprics created were Paris, Malines, Besançon, Lyons, Aix, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Bourges, Tours, and Rouen; the salaries of the archbishops were to be 15,000 francs, those of the bishops 10,000, and of the pastors 1,000 to 1,500. Of the property of the Church there were to be restored only the pastoral dwellings and the appertaining gardens; the use of bells was again permitted. The republican calendar was modified so that the week and its days were as they were before, Sunday thus being restored; in marriage the ecclesiastical ceremony was again given its place, but a prior civil license was required. This article also provided for the Protestants that no confessions were to be published without governmental approval; the State paid the salaries of the pastors, previously appropriating church property. Two seminaries were permitted in eastern France for the instruction of the candidates for the Lutheran ministry, and one in Geneva for the Reformed faith. The direction of Lutheran affairs was placed in the hands of local and general consistories, while the Reformed were to have synods based upon the Church census. This constructive article became law without being submitted to the pope. The appointment of bishops became the bone of contention, the pope desiring that the constitutional bishops be wholly excluded, while Napoleon gave twelve of the sixty bishoprics to them. By the concordat the pope had yielded to the First Consul what had been refused to the assembly—submission of the Church to the civil power, while the nonjuring clergy had now by command of the pope to agree to what they had formerly resisted. On the other hand, the Church had won a politically recognized existence and with this a large part of its legitimate power,

and in later time the papacy regarded as one of the victorious results the relegating of the French episcopacy to a position of dependence upon Rome. The concordat thus became the introduction to the Vatican Decrees (see VATICAN COUNCIL).

(P. TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A fine list of sources and literature is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xvi. 713–714. Consult further the works on the general history of the period. This bibliography, like the text, has in mind only the religious side of the French Revolution. Consult: F. C. Dreyfus, *L'Assistance sous la législature et la convention, 1791–1795*, Paris, 1905; A. Barruel, *History of the Clergy during the French Revolution*, 3 parts, London, 1794; H. Grégoire, *Mémoires, précédes d'une notice historique sur l'auteur par M. H. Carnot*, 2 vols., Paris, 1837; Abbé Jager, *Histoire de l'église de France pendant la révolution*, 3 vols., Paris, 1852; W. H. Jervis, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution*, London, 1882; F. X. Plasse, *Le Clergé français réfugié en Angleterre*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886; A. Gazier, *Études sur l'histoire religieuse de la révolution française*, Paris, 1887; P. L. Sciout, *Histoire de la constitution civile du clergé*, Paris, 1887; E. de Pressensé, *L'Église et la révolution française*, Paris, 1889; B. Robidou, *Histoire du clergé pendant la révolution française*, 2 vols., Paris, 1889; F. Chamard, *La Révolution, le concordat et la liberté religieuse*, Paris, 1891; P. G. Moreau, *Le Centenaire du martyre des Carmelites de Compiègne 1794*, Compiègne, 1894; F. Bournand, *Le Clergé sous la terreur*, Tours, 1895; A. Sicard, *À la recherche d'une religion civile*, Paris, 1895; P. A. Hamart, *Collectes à travers l'Europe pour les prêtres français déportés en Suisse pendant la Révolution, 1794–1797*, Paris, 1897; F. A. Aulard, *Paris pendant la réaction thermidorienne et sous le directoire*, 5 vols., Paris, 1898–1902; L. Bourgain, *L'Église d'Angers pendant la révolution et jusqu'en 1870*, Paris, 1898; A. Debidour, *Hist. des rapports de l'église et de l'état en France, 1789–1870*, Paris, 1898; O. Delarc, *L'Église de Paris pendant la révolution française, 1789–1801*, Paris, 1898; I. Manseau, *Les Prêtres et religieux déportés sur les côtes et dans les îles de la Charente inférieure*, 2 vols., Lille, 1898; J. F. E. Robinet, *Le Mouvement religieux à Paris pendant la révolution (1789–1801)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1898; A. Thys, *La Persécution religieuse en Belgique sous le directoire, 1789–1799*, Anvers, 1899; M. Bonneau, *Notes pour servir à l'histoire du clergé de l'Yonne pendant la révolution (1790–1800)*, Gens, 1900; B. Erdmannsdörfer, *Mirabeau*, Bielefeld, 1900; Abbé Ange de Lève des Ormause, *Massacres de septembre dans les prisons de Paris; arrestation des prêtres et des séminaristes de S. Sulpice à Issy, leur emprisonnément dans l'église des Carmes*, Paris, 1900; H. Belloc, *Robespierre*, London, 1901; Sophia H. Maclehose, *The Last Days of the French Monarchy*, Glasgow, 1901; idem, *From Monarchy to Republic in France, 1788–1792*, Glasgow, 1904; T. Carlyle, *The French Revolution*, new issue, 3 vols., London, 1902; C. Gomel, *Histoire financière de la législative et la convention, 1792–1795*, Paris, 1902–1905; R. de Teil, *Évêques et prêtres massacrés aux journées de septembre 1792 à Paris*, Paris, 1902; T. Kiefer, *Die deputierten Bischöfe der französischen Nationalversammlung und die constitution civile du clergé in den Jahren 1790–1792*, Freiburg, 1903; G. L. Scherger, *The Evolution of Modern Liberty. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man*, New York, 1904; H. d'Alméras, *Les Romans de l'histoire, le déisme et le culte de la raison*, Paris, 1905; U. Wahl, *Vorgeschichte der französischen Revolution*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1905–07; H. G. Graham, *Society in France before the Revolution*, Edinburgh, 1908.

FREPPEL, frep''pel', **CHARLES ÉMILE:** French Roman Catholic prelate; b. at Ehnheim (14 m. n. of Schlettstadt), Alsace, June 1, 1827; d. at Paris Dec. 22, 1891. He studied at Strasburg and was ordained priest in 1849. After teaching philosophy at a Carmelite school in Paris and being director of the episcopal college at Strasburg, he became one of the staff of Ste. Geneviève at Paris in 1853 and dean in 1867. From 1854 to 1870 he was professor of sacred eloquence in the faculty of Roman Catholic theology at Paris. In 1869 he was called to Rome to assist in the preliminary arrangements for the Vatican Council, and was a pronounced adherent of the dogma of papal infallibility. He was consecrated bishop of Angers in 1870, and was a vigorous prelate, being active in organizing pilgrimages to Paray-le-Monial, Puy, and elsewhere, and in founding a Catholic university at Angers. In 1880 he was returned as deputy from Brest, and became the leader of the clerical party. He attracted great notice by his opposition to the government, and by his outspoken ultramontanism, as well as by his anti-German sentiments. He favored the expeditions to Tunis (1881), Tonkin (1883), and Madagascar (1885), but his interference in Prussian ecclesiastical affairs was so active that it was suppressed by the French government. His numerous works include: *Les Pères apostoliques et leur époque* (Paris, 1859); *Les Apologistes chrétiens au deuxième siècle* (1860); *St. Irénée* (1861); *Examen critique de la vie de Jésus-Christ par M. Renan* (1863); *Conférences sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ* (1863); *Tertullien* (2 vols., 1864); *St. Cyprien* (1865); *Clément d'Alexandrie* (1865); *Examen critique des apôtres de M. Renan* (1866); *Origène* (2 vols., 1868); *Œuvres pastorales et oratoires* (9 vols., 1869–94); *Œuvres polémiques* (9 vols., 1874–88); *L'Église et les ouvriers* (1876); *Les devoirs du chrétien dans la vie civile* (1876); and *La Vie chrétienne* (1879). After his death appeared his *Bossuet et l'éloquence sacrée au dix-septième siècle* (2 vols., 1893); *Sermons inédits* (2 vols., 1895), and *Les Origines du christianisme* (2 vols., 1903).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Subileau, *Cinquante ans de ministère paroissial et d'autorité épiscopale en Anjou. Mgr. Angebault et Mgr. Freppel*, 2 parts, Paris, 1894; A. Ricard, *Monseigneur Freppel*, ib. 1892; É. Cornut, *Mgr. Freppel d'après des documents authentiques et inédits*, ib. 1893; E. Lesur and F. Bournand, *Un grand évêque: Mgr. Freppel*, ib. 1893.

FRESENIUS, frê'sê-nî'us, **JOHANN PHILIPP:** German theologian; b. at Niederwiesen (near Kreuznach, 8 m. s. of Bingen), Germany, Oct. 22, 1705; d. at Frankfort July 4, 1761. Despite his poverty, he entered the University of Strasburg in 1723, where he devoted himself especially to the study of the works of Luther. On Sept. 26, 1725 he defended a series of theses on justification, but was compelled to interrupt his studies on account of the illness of his father, whose clerical duties he assumed for a year. He was then appointed tutor in the family of the count of Salm-Grunbach, but his father died shortly afterward (May 25, 1727), and he became his successor at Oberwiesen. In 1731 he published at Augsburg his *Antiweislingerus* in answer to the *Friss Vogel oder stirb* of the Jesuit J. N. Weislinger. This pamphlet so angered the Roman Catholic clergy that an attempt was made to arrest him, but he escaped to Darmstadt, where he became acquainted with Landgrave Ernst Ludwig, who appointed him second court preacher at Giessen (1734). In 1735 he became collega primarius at the Pædagogium illustre, and also began to deliver exegetical and ascetic lectures at the university. From 1736 to 1742 he officiated as court deacon at Darmstadt, where he founded an institute for proselytes which added 400 members to the Lutheran Church. From 1742

to 1743 he was assistant professor and second city chaplain at Giessen; and from 1743 until his death he was minister at Frankfort.

Fresenius was a zealous opponent of the Moravian movement and of Zinzendorf, who called him a "devil incarnate." He also opposed the Reformed congregations of Frankfort, and thwarted their endeavors to obtain free exercise of their religion, and permission to establish churches. Among Fresenius's many works special mention may be made of the following: *Beicht- und Kommunionbuch* (Frankfort, 1746); *Bewährte Nachrichten von Herrnhutischen Sachen* (4 vols., 1747–51); *Nötige Prüfung der Zinzendorffschen Lehrart* (1748); *Pastoral-Sammlungen* (24 parts, 1748–60); *Heilsame Betrachtungen über die Sonn- und Festtagsevangelien* (1750, 1845, 1872); and *Zuverlässige Nachrichten von dem Leben, Tode und Schriften D. Joh. Albrecht Bengels* (1753). (G. E. STEITZ†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A life was appended to the sermon preached at the funeral by K. K. Griesbach (Halle, 1761?). Consult J. M. Lappenberg, *Reliquien des Fräulein von Klettenberg*, pp. 227–231, Hamburg, 1847.

FREYLINGHAUSEN, frī'ling-hau"zen, **JOHANN ANASTASIUS:** Pietist leader and hymn-writer; b. at Gandersheim (36 m. s.w. of Brunswick) Dec. 2, 1670; d. at Halle Feb. 12, 1739. His father was a merchant and *Bürgermeister* of Gandersheim. He attended the school in Eimbeck, living there with his grandfather, the councilor Dietrich Freylinghausen, and studied theology at Jena, Erfurt, and Halle. In Halle he assisted Francke as well in his sermons and parochial duties as in the establishment of his well-known institutions (see FRANCKE, AUGUST HERMANN). When Francke, in 1715, was called as pastor to the church of St. Ulrich, Freylinghausen became his assistant and married his only daughter. Assistant superintendent of the Paedagogium and of the orphan asylum from 1723, he became, after Francke's death, and in association with the latter's son, superintendent of both institutions and also head pastor of St. Ulrich's. From 1728 he had several attacks of paralysis, but continued his labors to the end.

Freylinghausen is one of the most noteworthy of the group of gifted men who, deeply interested in the ideas of Spener, worked together zealously for their realization. Francke often called him his right hand. He is most widely known as a poet, and is distinguished among the poets of German Pietism by his imagination and delicacy of taste. His hymns—forty-four are ascribed to him with certainty—are characterized by Scriptural phrases and conceptions, but never sink to the level of Biblical doggerel. His importance in the history of spiritual song, however, depends principally on the hymnals which he edited, in which many hymns from the circle of the Pietists first saw the light. The earliest of these hymnals appeared in 1704 and contained 683 hymns (2d ed., 1705, with seventy-five additional hymns); the second in 1714, containing 798 hymns and seventeen psalms for festal occasions (2d ed., 1719, with three additional hymns). A selection from both was published in 1718, containing 1,050 hymns. A complete hymnal after Freylinghausen was brought out by Francke's son, Gotthilf August Francke, in 1741. In these hymnals, the personal devotion peculiar to Pietism appears for the first time to claim an equal place with the objectivity of the older hymns. The musical part was even more of a novelty than the poetical. The melodies, sometimes composed by Freylinghausen himself, differ from the older ones in their triple-time, in the tripping movement of the tune with the constant refrains, and in the flourishes with which the principal part is overcharged.

Freylinghausen was also prominent as a catechist. His *Grundlegung der Theologie* (Halle, 1703) was even used as a guide in academic lectures by Rambach, Baumgarten and others. That the simple and instructive style of Freylinghausen's preaching was fully appreciated appears from the fact that, at the request of the theological faculty of Halle, he delivered lectures to the students on homiletics, a branch of study which was first included in the theological curriculum on the initiative of Halle. CARL BERTHEAU.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The hymns were edited by L. Grote in the second part of W. Schirck's *Geistliche Sänger*, Halle, 1855, and many were translated by Catherine Winkworth in *Lyra Germanica*, London, 1868. For the life consult: *Ehrengedächtnis Freylinghausens*, Halle, 1740; *Nachrichten von dem Charakter und der Amtsführung rechtschaffener Prediger und Seelsorger*, v. 188–198, ib. 1777; H. Döring, *Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands*, i. 439–445, Neustadt, 1835; J. L. Pasig, in Knapp's *Christoterpe*, 1852, pp. 211–262; A. Walter, *Leben J. A. Freylinghausens*, Berlin, 1864; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, iv. 322–334, Stuttgart, 1868; *ADB*, vii. 370–371. On his hymn-books and the new melodies therein consult Koch, ut sup., iv. 300 sqq., v. 586 sqq.; G. Döring, *Choralkunde*, 159 sqq. et passim, Danzig, 1865; J. Zahn, *Die Melodien der deutschen evangelischen Kirchenlieder*, vi. 573 sqq. et passim, Gütersloh, 1893; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 395–397.

FRIAR: A corruption of *frater*, the distinguishing title of the members of the Mendicant Monks (q.v.).

FRICKE, GUSTAV ADOLF: German Lutheran; b. at Leipsic Aug. 23, 1822; d. in Leipsic March 30, 1908. He studied at the university of his native city, where he became privat-docent in 1846. In 1849 he was appointed associate professor of theology in the same university, and in 1851 went to Kiel as full professor of theology. In 1865 he returned to Leipsic as chief catechist at St. Peter's, and in 1867 was appointed professor of New Testament exegesis, ethics, and dogmatics. He wrote *Die Erhebung zum Herrn im Gebete* (Leipsic, 1850); *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, i. (1850); *Gottesgrüsse* (sermons; 2 vols., 1883–86); and *Aus dem Feldzuge 1886, Briefe aus dem Felde und Predigten und Reden im Felde* (1891).

FRIDOLIN (FRIDOLD): Reputed founder of the monastery of Säckingen (on the Rhine, 20 m. above Basel), which is first mentioned as presented by Charles the Fat in 878 to his wife. According to the detailed but unreliable life by Balther, a monk of St. Gallen of the tenth or eleventh century, Fridolin was born in Ireland of noble parents. He

received an excellent education, and decided to become a priest. After preaching the Gospel in his own country he went to Gaul as a missionary, making his abode at Poitiers. Here he occupied himself chiefly with collecting relics of St. Hilary, and the saint appeared to him in a vision and exhorted him to revive his cult. With the aid of Clovis, the ruler of the Franks, he erected a church for the bones of Hilary, who then commanded him to go to Alemannia to an island in the Rhine. After founding a monastery and several churches on the Rhine he finally reached the island (Säckingen), and founded a church and a nunnery there. He was highly esteemed for saintliness and on account of the miracles which he wrought. This report was written about 500 years after the date of the alleged events. Balther claims to have taken his account from an older biography of Fridolin, but this is doubtful, and the whole history seems to have been Balther's invention as it fits into neither the reign of Clovis I. nor that of Clovis II. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Balther's life, ed. B. Krusch, is in *MGH, Script rer. Merov.*, iii (1896), 350–369, and with a thirteenth century German transl., in F. J. Mone, *Quellensammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte*, i. 1–17, 99–111, Carlsruhe, 1848. Consult Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 29 sqq.; Friedrich, *KD*, ii. 411 sqq.; Hauck, *KD*, i. 328; J. H. A. Ehrard, *Die iroschottische Missionskirche*, p. 285, Gütersloh, 1873; H. Leo, *Der heilige Fridolin*, Freiburg, 1886; Wattenhach, *DGQ*, i. 620; *ADB*, vii. 385–387.

FRIDUGIS, frî''dü''zhî' (**FREDEGISUS, FRIDUGISUS, FREDEGIS, FREDUGIS**): French ecclesiastic and statesman; b. in England in the second half of the eighth century; d. in France 834. He left his native country for France some time before 796 and became a favorite pupil of Alcuin. He was a deacon at the French court in that year, and four years later had become archdeacon and teacher at the academy. After the death of Alcuin in 804, Charlemagne appointed Fridugis abbot of St. Martin's in Tours, later giving him the monasteries of St. Omer and St. Bertin. From 819 to 832 he was chancellor of Louis the Pious, in which office he made a number of praiseworthy innovations, but his career as an abbot was less creditable. Fridugis was the author of an *Epistola ad proceres*, in which he discusses light and darkness as positive entities, not as abstract negations. He likewise wrote another work which is lost, although its contents are known from Agobard's *Libcr contra objectiones Fredegesi*, which states that in it Fridugis maintained the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture.

Bibliography: Sources are the *Epistolæ* of Alcuin, nos. 99, 105, 155, 180, 197, and the *Vita Alcuini* (see under Alcuin); Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, chap. xxxii. in *MGH, Script.*, ii (1829), 426-463; Theodulph, *Carmina*, 25, ed. Dümmler in *MGH, Poetæ Lat. ævi Carolini*, i (1881), 569-573. Consult: C. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Carlsruhe, 1840; H. F. Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung*, Sondershausen, 1875–77; M. Ahner *Fredegis von Tours*, Leipsic, 1878; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 137, 148 sqq., 574.

FRIEDBERG, frîd'berg, **EMIL ALBERT**: German Protestant jurist; b. at Konitz (62 m. s.w. of Danzig) Dec. 22, 1837. He studied in Berlin (Dr.Jur., 1861) and Heidelberg, and was privat-docent at Berlin (1862–65), associate professor at Halle (1865–68), and full professor at Freiburg (1868–69). Since 1869 he has been professor of canon and German law at Leipsic. Among his numerous writings mention may be made of the following, as of theological interest: *De finium inter ecclesiam et civitatem regendorum judicio quid medii ævi doctores et leges statuerint* (Leipsic, 1861); *Die evangelische und katholische Kirche der neu einverleibten Länder in ihren Beziehungen zur protestantischen Landeskirche und zum Staate* (Halle, 1867); *Aus deutschen Bussbüchern* (1868); *Das Vcto der Regierung bei Bischofswahl in Preussen und der ober-rheinischen Kirchenprovinz* (1869); *Agenda wie es in des Churfürsten zu Sachsen Landen in den Kirchen gehalten wird* (1869); *Der Staat und die katholische Kirche im Grossherzogtum Baden seit 1860* (Leipsic, 1871); *Akten-Stücke zum ersten vatikanischen Konzil* (1872); *Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche* (3 vols., Tübingen, 1872); *Johann Baptist Baltzer* (Leipsic,1873); *Der Staat und die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland* (2 vols., 1874); *Akten-Stücke die altkatholische Bewegung betreffend* (Tübingen, 1876); *Corpus juris canonici* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1879–81); *Lehrbuch des katholischen und evangelischen Kirchenrechts* (1879); *Quinque compilationes antiquæ* (1882); *Die geltenden Verfassungsgesetze der evangelischen deutschen Landeskirche* (Freiburg, 1885); also four supplementary volumes, 1888–1904); and *Canones Sammlungen zwischen Gratian und Bernhard von Pavia* (1897). From 1864 to 1892 he edited the *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht* in collaboration with R. Dove, and since 1892 he and E. Sehling have edited the successor of this periodical, the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht.*

FRIEDLAENDER, MICHAEL: Jewish scholar; b. at Jutroschin (38 m. n. of Breslau), Germany, Apr. 29, 1833. He studied in Berlin and Halle (Ph.D., 1862), and at the Talmud Thorah, of which he was director until 1865, when he became principal of Jews' College, London, resigning in 1907. He has written, edited, or translated *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah* (3 vols., London, 1873–77); *The Guide of the Perplexed* of Maimonides (3 vols., 1885); *The Jewish Religion* (1891); and also a revision of the Authorized Version with the Hebrew text (1882) and the second edition of Lady Katie Magnus' *Outlines of Jewish History from B.C. 586 to C.E. 1885* (1888).

FRIEDRICH, JOHANN: German Old Catholic; b. at Poxdorf June 5, 1836. He studied in Bamberg and Munich, and was ordained to the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church in 1859. He was chaplain of Markscheinfeld until 1862, when he became privat-docent at Munich. In 1865 he was appointed associate professor in the same university and in 1869 was called to Rome as a councilor in the Vatican council. He refused to accept the dogma of papal infallibility and in 1871 was excommunicated and was also deprived of his benefice for violating a fundamental principle of the Church in giving the sacrament to a colleague who had fallen under ecclesiastical condemnation. Notwithstanding the protests of the bishops, he was promoted to the rank of full professor in Munich in

1872, and in 1874–75 was professor of church history at Bern. He then returned to Munich, but in 1882 was transferred, in deference to the protests of the Ultramontane party, from the theological to the philosophical faculty of the university, where he has since been professor of history. He has written *Johann Wessel* (Regensburg, 1862); *Die Lehre des Johann Hus und ihre Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der neueren Zeit* (1862); *Astrologie und Reformation* (Munich, 1864); *Das wahre Zeitalter des heiligen Ruperts* (Bamberg, 1866); *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (2 vols., 1867–69); *Tagebuch während des vatikanischen Konzils geführt* (Nördlingen, 1871); *Documenta ad illustrandum concilium Vaticanum* (1871); *Der Mechanismus der vatikanischen Religion* (Innsbruck, 1876); *Beiträge zur Kirchen-Geschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1876); *Geschichte des vatikanischen Konzils* (3 vols., Bonn, 1877–87); *Zur ältesten Geschichte des Primats in der Kirche* (1879); *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuiten-Ordens* (Munich, 1881); *Die Konstantin-Schenkung* (Nördlingen, 1889); *Johann Adam Möller, der Symboliker* (Munich, 1894); *Jakob Froschhammer* (Fürth, 1896); and *Ignaz von Döllinger* (3 parts, Munich, 1899–1901). He likewise published a revised edition of J. J. I. von Döllinger's *Janus* under the title *Das Pabsttum* (Munich, 1892) and prepared the second edition of the same theologian's *Pabstfabeln des Mittelalters* (1890).

FRIENDS OF GOD: A group of German mystics of the fourteenth century. The expression "Friend of God" is taken from the Bible (John xv. 14–15).

Meaning of Term.

In the twelfth century it was used to denote a religious tendency which was strongly influenced by the teaching of Bernard of Clairvaux. In the next century it became commoner, but in the fourteenth in the writings of the mystics its meaning became more restricted and expressed the ideal which they strove to reach, the being raised through Christ out of a state of servitude into the divine friendship and sonship. Three stages in man's religious development were recognized by the mystics: beginning, growth, and perfection. The perfect man, the true friend of God, can put justification by faith at the beginning of his carecr, for God will deny none of his requests. Such friends of God Tauler called the pillars of the Church; and not only could priests and monks become friends of God, but even a devout layman. However, there were many kinds, including a more perfect class, the hidden sons of God; some even enumerated nine different grades. Heretics were sometimes called friends of God, for instance, the Waldenses. Though they differed from their fellows in their thoughts and in their withdrawal from the world, these "friends" did not form a definite sect. They had no brotherhood; but their ideal was a mystical union such as Henry of Nördlingen (q.v.) urged his penitent Margareta Ehner (q.v.) to work for with other women. Henry of Nördlingen is the only source for an account of the spread of this mysticism, whose teachers included such men as Eckhart, Tauler, Seuse, Henry of Nördlingen, Nicholas of Strasburg, and others, in the valley of the Rhine, Switzerland, Bavaria, and Franconia.

Rulman Merswin.

Rulman Merswin, the chief author of the Friends of God, was born in Strasburg in 1307. and died in the cloister of the "Grüner Wörth" (on an island in the Ill near Strasburg) July 18, 1382. He was, as his father had been before him, a well-to-do banker in his native city. When he was forty years old, he and his second wife renounced the world and ten years later were granted an indulgence by Pope Clement VI. In 1367 he obtained from the Benedictines the cloister of the "Grüner Wörth," which four years later he gave to the Knights of St. John, retiring thither himself. He named the commander of the order as the head of the monastery, but obliged him to render a report of his administration yearly to Merswin and two others. Merswin remained the real ruler of the monastery until his death. In his lifetime he was never suspected of being a writer, but after his death many books were found written by his pen: the "Story of my Conversion"; the "Book of the Nine Rocks"; the "Little Banner Book"; the "Book of the Three Conversions and of a Holy and Learned Pastor who was the Pupil of Master Eckhart"; a selection from the "Spiritual Marriage" of Ruysbroeck; and the "Seven Works of Mercy" (these works have all been printed except the last one). All these tracts are compilations, with Merswin's own thoughts scattered here and there. The original matter is plainly the work of an ignorant, unskilful layman; its chief content is complaints of the corrupt manners of the Christian communities of the time. In the story of his conversion Merswin relates how he made the acquaintance of the "Great Friend of God from the Highlands" in 1351, who, although unknown to the rest of the world, became his secret friend. At his request he wrote the story of his own conversion and in return received a like treatise from the Great Friend. These two books were to be kept quite secret from all but themselves.

The Great Friend.

The Knights of St. John told how the Great Friend entrusted to Merswin a large quantity of writings, which Merswin kept concealed for thirty years, hut four years before his death showed them to the brothers of the order, first carefully erasing all the proper names. There are ahout fifteen separate works attributed to the Great Friend, besides a large collection of letters said to have been written by him to the monks in the "Grüner Wörth." From all this material it is gathered that the Great Friend after a sudden conversion in the midst of worldly pleasures retired into solitude and formed the central point of a secret brotherhood by whom he was reverenced almost like a god. His influence extended to all classes, even to Jews and heathens, and he had correspondents in Hungary and in Italy. In 1365 he retired to a mountain in the territory of the duke of Austria, but Merswin alone knew the exact spot. Regarding the retreat of the Great Friend the Knights of St. John questioned Merswin in vain, even on his death-bed, when, however, he informed

them that the secret messenger passing between him and the Great Friend had died the previous year. Many expeditions were sent to search for the Great Friend, even as late as 1390 In later times the Great Friend was identified with Nicholas of Basel, a layman who, having spread the heresies of the Beghards (see BEGHARDS, BEGUINES) through the country around Basel, was burned at the stake in Vienna (1395); also with John of Chur, a pious hermit who lived in a cell on the Rütberg in the canton of St. Gall. In his writings everything is vague, and there are many contradictions. He has no definite doctrines and no more knowledge of theology than any other devout layman. An account of a pilgrimage to Rome in 1377 is certainly a fiction. The Great Friend must have been an invention; no one could see him or could carry on a correspondence with him except through Merswin, and when Merswin died all trace of him suddenly vanished. It is then almost certain that Merswin himself invented the whole story of the Great Friend, a conjecture that is strengthened by the close correspondence in matter and style between his own writings and those attributed to the Great Friend.

(PHILIPP STRAUCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the Friends of God consult: K. Schmidt, *Johannes Tauler von Strassburg*, pp. 161 sqq., Hamburg, 1841; idem, *Die Gottesfreunde im 14. Jahrhundert*, Jena, 1854; Röhrich, in *ZHT*, x. 1 (1840), 118 sqq.; W. Wackernagel, *Kleinere Schriften*, ii. 146 sqq., Leipsic, 1873; idem, *Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete*, pp. 381 sqq., 583 sqq., Basel, 1876; M. Rieger, *Die Gottesfreunde im deutschen Mittelalter*, Heidelberg, 1879; *KL*, v. 893–900. For the works and life of Merswin consult the editions of the "Book of the Nine Rocks" by K. Schmidt, Leipsic, 1859; by B. Waalkes, Leeuwarden, 1882; by Strauss, in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, xxxiv (1902), 235 sqq.; and further, J. G. V Engelhardt, *Richard von St. Victor und Johannes Ruysbroek*, pp. 345 sqq., Erlangen, 1838; K. Schmidt, in *ZHT*, ix (1839), 61 sqq.; idem, in *Revue d'Alsace*, vii (1856), 145 sqq., 193 sqq.; A. Jundt, *Hist. du panthéisme populaire au moyen âge*, pp. 211 sqq., Paris, 1875; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, i. 224, 321, 336, 8th ed., London, n.d. The extensive literature upon the question of the "Great Friend of God" is indicated in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xvii. 203.

FRIENDS OF LIGHT. See FREE CONGREGATIONS IN GERMANY.

FRIENDS, SOCIETY OF.

I. Origin and History.
George Fox (§ 1).
Rapid Growth (§ 2).
Friends in the American Colonies (§ 3).
Persecution (§ 4).
Later Development (§5).
Differences. The Hicksite Separation (§ 6).
The Gurneyite and Wilburite Movements (§7).
Missionary Work (§ 8).
II. Doctrine and Practise.
Distinctive Creed (§ 1).
The Ministry (§2).
Worship (§ 3).
III. Educational Institutions.
IV Organizations and Statistics.

The Society of Friends originated in England in the seventeenth century and spread thence to the English colonies. A few small congregations have existed at times in other countries (France, Germany, Norway, etc.), but practically the history of the Society is confined to England and America. The popular name "Quakers" is said to have been given by a local judge at Derby, Oct. 30, 1650 (cf. L. Muggleton, *The Acts of the Witness of the Spirit*, pp. 94–95, London, 1699; cf. *DNB*, xx. 119).

I. Origin and History: The rise of the Friends is one of the most noteworthy events in the religious history of England in the seventeenth century. In the midst of the efforts then made to rescue the Church from the corruptions which had grown up around it, there were men who felt that Luther and Cranmer had not gone far enough, and that there was still much sacerdotalism to be purged away, before the original simplicity of Christianity could be restored. Such men found a leader in George Fox (q.v.). He and his followers announced as their aim the revival of primitive Christianity; and this phrase remains as the best definition of their work. The privilege of direct access to God, without the intervention of human priest or rite, was revealed to Fox's soul. Having found one, "even Christ Jesus, who could speak to his condition," he longed to impart his discovery of the spirituality of true religion to others, and in 1647 began his labors in public ministry, going forth through England on foot, and at his own charges. His message appears to have been mainly to direct the people to the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, who died for them, and had sent his spirit into their hearts, to instruct and guide them in the things pertaining to life and salvation. "I was sent," he says, "to turn people from darkness to the light, that they might receive Christ Jesus; for, to as many as should receive him in his light, I saw that he would give power to become the sons of God, which I had obtained by receiving Christ. I was to direct people to the Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures, by which they might be led into all truth, and so up to Christ and God, as those had been who gave them forth." To the illumination of the Holy Spirit in the heart he turned the attention of all, as that by which sin was made manifest and reproved, duty unfolded, and ability given to run with alacrity and joy in the way of God's commandments. He preached repentance toward God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and showed that one became a true disciple not by a bare assent of the understanding to the truths contained in the Bible, nor by any outward rite, but by a real change of the heart and affections, through the power of the Holy Spirit. The inward light became not merely a mystical communion with God, but also a source of strength and guidance in the practical affairs of religion.

1. George Fox.

The soil was ready for the seed, and the rapid spread of Fox's doctrines was surprising. All classes flocked to his preaching; and among his converts were persons of the best families in the kingdom, priests of the Established Church, and ministers of other societies, and many men of wealth and learning. For four years Fox was the only minister of the society; the second preacher was Elizabeth Hooton (d. 1672). In the fifth year there were twenty-five preachers; in the seventh, upward of sixty. Within eight years, ministers of Friends preached in various parts of Europe, in Asia, and in Africa, and heroically endured persecution in Rome, Malta, Austria, Hungary, and other places. Among the noteworthy preachers in the earlier years, Francis Howgill, John Audland, and Samuel Fisher had been clergymen; George Bishop, Rich-

2. Rapid Growth.

ard Hubberthorn, and William Ames, officers in the army; Anthony Pearson and John Crook, justices of the peace. The courtly and cultured William Penn, and Robert Barclay (qq.v.), a member of a noble family in Scotland, a near relative of the Stuart kings, and a man of thorough classical and patristic scholarship, joined the society about twenty years after its formation. In 1680 the number of Friends in Great Britain was not less than 66,000.

America was first visited by Friends in 1656, when Mary Fisher and Anne Austin arrived in Boston from Barbados, to which island they had gone to preach the Gospel the preceding year.

3. Friends in the American Colonies. They were charged with holding "very dangerous, heretical, and blasphemous opinions," and were kept in close confinement, at first on the vessel, and afterward in jail. Their books were burned by the common executioner, and even their persons were searched to discover signs of witchcraft. They were then sent back to Barbados. In 1660 this same Mary Fisher held an interview with Sultan Mahomet IV., at Adrianople, where he was then encamped with his army. Two days after the banishment of the first Friends from Boston, a vessel having on board eight other Friends arrived from London. They were at once imprisoned, and, eleven weeks afterward, were sent to England. But, nothing daunted, others of the same faith continued to arrive in New England, to suffer scourging, imprisonment, banishment, and four of their number (William Robinson and Marmaduke Stevenson in 1659, Mary Dyer in 1660, and William Leddra in 1661), death by the gallows. Monthly meetings had been established in New England before 1660, and in 1661 a yearly meeting in Rhode Island, which has been continued regularly to the present date. New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas were visited very early; and, although there was much persecution, flourishing communities of Friends sprang up. George Fox himself made an extended journey in America in 1671–73. But the most important event in the early history of the society on this continent was the settlement of Pennsylvania by William Penn and a large number of his brethren in faith, beginning in 1682. In 1690 there were at least 10,000 Friends in the American Colonies, and in 1702, 20,000 in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. For an account of the schism in America, 1692 and later, see KEITH, GEORGE.

While no Friends in England suffered immediate martyrdom, the sum of their persecution was very great. Between 1650 and 1689 14,000 of them were fined and imprisoned; and 369, including the majority of the first preachers, died in jail, "not to mention cruel mockings, buffetings, scourgings, and afflictions innumerable." Never were persecutions borne in a more heroic spirit of endurance, or in a more Christian spirit of forgiveness. Never, too, were the inalienable rights of conscience more bravely asserted, and the privileges of Englishmen more boldly claimed. "The trials of the Friends, and especially that of John Crook in 1662, and that of William Penn and William Mead in 1670, at the Old Bailey, will forever remain as noble monuments of their resistance to the arbitrary proceedings of the courts of judicature at that time, and the violent infringement of the privilege of jury." Soon after the Revolution of 1688, the persecution ceased on both sides of the Atlantic.

4. Persecution.

When the martyr age had passed, the society became less aggressive, and made fewer converts to its views; but it devoted itself to the quiet practise of the Christian virtues, and to active philanthropy. An exaggerated asceticism in certain directions, and a rigid, though in some respects an admirable, discipline, visiting with excommunication even the offense of marrying a person not a member of the society, cooperated to keep it numerically small. In the recognition of the equal rights of women, in the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade, in the protection and instruction of the Indians and the weaker races of mankind, in the amelioration of penal laws and prison discipline, in the adoption of enlightened methods for the care and relief of the insane, in testimony against war, intemperance, oaths, corrupting books and amusements, extravagance, insincerity, and vain display, it has been in the forefront of Christian reformers; while it has maintained high standards of integrity and practical virtue, and in the every-day charities of life its bounty has been liberal.

5. Later Development.

The Society in early days was an association of sympathetic believers without any adopted written creed or list of members. In time birthright membership was introduced and this created a non-convinced element. About the middle of the eighteenth century such varied views and practises prevailed that on both sides of the ocean disciplinary regulations were adopted, and these in time came to be looked upon as an essential part of original Quakerism. Men of liberal views and varying habits were lost. This rigidity lasted well into the nineteenth century, but in 1827 came the great separation. The differences had been smoldering for years. The central figure was Elias Hicks (q.v.), an eloquent minister from Long Island. From him one body was called Hicksite while the other was known as Orthodox, though neither side formally adopted the title. The former contained many Unitarians, but their basis was the non-necessity of the beliefs commonly known as Orthodox. In many cases there was an extension of the belief of the early Friends as to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, so as to repudiate the common Orthodox conceptions of the deity and atonement of Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures. The other body held to these, as taught by their ancestors, but held to them with such disciplinary rigidity that sympathetic believers, who cared more for freedom of opinion than for any particular belief were driven into the opposite branch. The formal separation began in Philadelphia in 1827 and extended to the yearly meetings of New York, Baltimore, Ohio and Indiana. In the three eastern yearly meetings the Hicksites were a large majority. In London, Dub-

6. Differences. The Hicksite Separation.

lin, New England, and North Carolina, the whole meeting went with the Orthodox body, leaving them as a whole the strongest and best organized. Both bodies have lost numbers in the eastern United States since this date, though of late years the tide has probably turned. In England there was also a gradual loss till about 1870 when "adult school" work and missionary effort began to increase the zeal and spirit of the younger members. English Friends, with divergent doctrinal views, have been free from serious dissensions and are now an open-minded and progressive body.

7. The Gurneyite and Wilburite Movements.

About 1840 there began a new tendency among Orthodox Friends—an Evangelical reaction from the Hicksite position. This was led by an English minister, Joseph John Gurney (q.v.), and hence is commonly known as a "Gurneyite" movement. The opposition from a stanch upholder of ancient ways was called "Wilburite" (see WILBUR, JOHN). The controversy so far as it was theological centered about such questions as the relative authority of the Spirit and the Scriptures, the historic and the living Christ, and their places in the plan of salvation. Small divisions resulted, the Wilburite bodies being generally few in number, though Philadelphia as a whole sympathized with them. In the West the Gurneyite movement swept on with a great revivalistic agitation on Methodist lines, bringing great numbers into membership, but for a time almost destroying the landmarks of Quakerism. This has since in turn produced its reaction and the original basis of friendly doctrine and practise has to some extent reasserted itself.

8. Missionary Work.

Organized missionary work of Friends is of comparatively recent date, although in earlier time a number of itinerant ministers carried their messages to many parts of the world. About 1866 the Friends' Missionary Society in England established the work in India. The next year some work in Madagascar followed, and two years later stations were organized in Syria. In 1886 China was added to the list, and in 1896, Ceylon. The English Friends now maintain about 100 missionaries in the field in these stations, and very considerable success has attended the effort. American Friends have missions in Alaska, Mexico, Cuba, Jamaica, Japan, and East Africa, and are associated with English Friends in the missions in Syria and China. These have all been established since 1871, and are managed for the most part by the American Friends' Board of Foreign Missions, which sustains about ninety workers. The English Friends devote yearly about $150,000 to the work, and the American Friends something like one-half this amount. The tendency of the work of the missions has been largely educational as well as Evangelical, and no special attention has been given to adding members to the Society of Friends.

II. Doctrine and Practise: The creed of the Society of Friends, if it may be so called, has always been simple and Biblical. What is most distinctive of the Society is its belief in the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, and its expectation of the guidance of the Spirit in worship and all religious acts. This might degenerate into pure mysticism, were it not corrected by the Society's recognition of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, by which they admit in the words of Barclay "as a positive certain maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, should be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the Devil." Their belief in the spirituality of Christianity has led them, also, to the disuse of the outward rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, while they fully believe in the necessity of spiritual baptism, and the privilege of spiritual communion with the Father and the Son, through the Holy Spirit. They do not find, in the texts ordinarily understood as establishing these rites, any indication of such intention, and regard the rites themselves as inconsistent with the whole spirit of Christianity, in which types have given place to the substance.

1. Distinctive Creed.

Their views in regard to the ministry are also characteristic. They believe that no one should preach the Word without a direct call from God, and that this call may come to male or female, old or young. No high human learning and no course of theological study are necessary qualifications for a minister, who may be as unlettered as were most of the apostles, if plenteously endued with heavenly grace. But Friends do not deny the self-evident proposition, that learning and intellectual ability conduce to the usefulness of a preacher of the Gospel, and that a church needs men possessing both, to assert and defend the truth. Any one who feels it laid upon him is allowed to speak in the meetings for worship, so long as he speaks things worthy of the occasion. If, after sufficient probation, he gives evidence of a divine call, he is formally acknowledged as a minister, and is allowed one of the seats at the head of the meeting. Besides ministers, the Society appoints elders, whose especial duty is to sympathize with and advise ministers, and watch that they be sound in the faith; and overseers, as in the primitive Church, who have a general care of the flock. In meetings for business, the society recognizes the presidency of the great head of the Church, and strives to do all in his fear, and with his guidance. Decisions are not made by votes and majorities, but are recorded by the clerk, in accordance with what appears to be "the weight" of either side; or, if there is not a general spirit of acquiescence, action is postponed.

2. The Ministry.

Believing that every act of divine service should proceed from an immediate impression of duty, prompted by the Holy Spirit, many meetings of the Society for worship are held in silence, unless some one feels called upon to preach or teach, to offer prayer in behalf of the congregation, or to give praise to the Most High. But this silence is itself intended to be occupied with religious acts. Highest of these is the direct communion of the soul with its Maker and its Lord, in rapt devotion, in thanksgiving and prayer. But there are services, in these hours of silence, adapted to every degree of religious ex-

3. Worship.

perience and every serious mood of mind. One of the most profitable of these is self-examination. As in the sight of the All-Seeing Eye, the humble worshiper recounts his thoughts and deeds, confesses his sins, supplicates for pardon for the past and strength for the future, and prays that he may be cleansed even from secret faults. Another exercise is religious meditation. At least, every attender can force himself to think on profitable themes by repeating to himself texts of Scripture, or the verses of some suggestive hymn. "Sometimes a light surprises" the humble worshiper; his thoughts are led on and upward by a higher Power; new meanings of texts flash upon his mind, a new illumination is given to the path of duty, and in answer to the prayer breathed forth by his inmost soul he feels conscious of a closer union with God, and strengthened for his future warfare with the world, the flesh, and the devil. And, if some brother or sister is led to offer vocal service, it often happens that the word of exhortation or reproof or comfort, or the earnest petition to the throne of grace, harmonizes with the private exercise of mind which the hearer has passed through, confirming his faith, and invigorating his resolution.

III. Educational Institutions: The educational institutions of higher grade among Friends of England are,—Dalton Hall, a hall of residence connected with the University of Manchester, which supplies living and instruction, but grants no degrees, and Woodbrooke Settlement, an institution near Birmingham, where courses of study are given to adults in sociology, Bible history and criticism, and religious movements. Of the secondary grade there are the following: Bootham and Mount Schools at York, one for boys and one for girls, which prepare for London matriculation examinations; Leighton Park School, near Reading, which prepares for the universities; Ackworth School, founded in 1779, of rather lower grade than the others; belonging to the same class, educationally considered, are Sidcot, Saffron-Walden, Ayton, Sibford, and one or two others. A very strong movement in England of a different character is the adult school system, originated and managed chiefly by Friends, which embraces Bible lessons, educational opportunities, and many beneficial agencies. There are (1906) about 82,000 scholars in these schools and the number is rapidly increasing. It is a movement of great moral and social significance.

In America the Orthodox bodies have Haverford and Bryn Mawr Colleges near Philadelphia, Guilford College in North Carolina, Wilmington College in Ohio, Earlham College in Indiana, Penn College in Iowa, Pacific College in Oregon, and Whittier College in California. New England, New York and Philadelphia yearly meetings also conduct boarding-schools and the latter a number of primary and secondary schools. The school founded by William Penn, the William Penn Charter School, is managed by a board of Philadelphia Friends. There are various Friends' academies in the West. Swarthmore College near Philadelphia is under the control of the Hicksite branch, which also has a number of flourishing schools in and around New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. While Friends in early days had an excellent system of schools, so that illiterate Quakers were unknown, the belief that education was not imperative for ministers led to a neglect of higher training; attempts to rectify this began to be made about 1850, and the colleges mentioned above have sprung up since this date.

IV. Organization and Statistics: The congregations are grouped together to constitute monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings; the monthly meetings send representatives to the quarterly, and the quarterly to the yearly. The yearly meetings are separate in their jurisdiction, each one determining its own course of procedure. They are united with each other in epistolary correspondence, and the Orthodox meetings send representatives to the "Five Years' Meeting," the conclusions of which are simply advisory. The yearly meetings and all subordinate meetings have no presiding officer. There is a clerk appointed yearly whose duty it is to minute the conclusions of the meeting. If necessary he may exercise the office of moderator, but he is distinctly the servant and not the master of the meeting. Votes are not usually taken. After a full discussion the clerk writes his minute and reads it. If this is not satisfactory the meeting may direct a change. If there is division of sentiment, it is his duty to gather the "sense of the meeting," the weight of the speakers as well as their numbers counting in his final estimate. If there is strong opposition to a new proposition it is dropped. A simple majority would not introduce an innovation. In all meetings except the representative meetings, which are in reality executive bodies, every member of the Society of Friends is entitled to be present and to speak to business. The recent establishment of "The Five Years' Meeting," composed of delegates from each of the yearly meetings, bids fair to become a permanent national organization of great consequence. There are two yearly meetings of the Orthodox in Great Britain and fourteen in America; of the Hicksites, six in America. The total figures are as follows:

Orthodox—America (1904)	92,265	
British Islands (1904)	21,890	
		114,155
Hicksite—America (1900)		21,356
Wilburite—America (1890)		4,561
		140,072
Foreign Mission Fields		5,767
		145,839

ISAAC SHARPLESS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For lists of early books by, on, and against Quakers consult: J. Smith, *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books*, privately printed, 1867; idem, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana*, ib. 1873; idem, *Supplement*, London, 1893. Consult: George Fox, *Journal*, London, 1694, ed. R. M. Jones, Philadelphia, 1904; I. Penington, *Works*, London, 1681; W. Sewel, *Hist. of the People called Quakers*, London, 1722, Philadelphia, 1855; *R. Claridge, Life and Posthumous Works*, Collected by J. Besse, London, 1726; J. Besse, *Sufferings of the People called Quakers*, ib. 1738; William Penn, *Select Works*, ib. 1771; J. Woolman, *Journal of Life, Gospel Labours, and Christian Experience*, Dublin, 1776, edited

with Introduction by J. G. Whittier, Boston, 1871; J. Gough, *Hist. of the People called Quakers*, 4 vols., Dublin, 1789–90 (comes down to 1764); Elias Hicks, *Sermons*, Philadelphia, 1825; idem, *Journal*, New York, 1832; J. Comly, *Friends' Miscellany*, 12 vols., 1831–1839; H. Christmas, *Concise Hist. of the Hampden Controversy*, London, 1848; J. Bowden, *Hist. of Friends in America*, ib. 1850; J. Barclay, *Diary of Alexander Jaffray, and Memoirs of the Quakers in the North of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1856; E. Michener, *Portraiture of Early Quakerism*, Philadelphia, 1860; W. Hodgson, *Select Historical Memoirs of the Society of Friends . 17th and 18th Centuries*, Philadelphia, 1867; idem, *Society of Friends in 19th Century*, ib. 1876; J. Cunningham, *The Quakers*, Edinburgh, 1868; C. Evans, *Friends in the 17th Century*, Philadelphia, 1875; Frances Anne Budge, *Annals of the Early Friends*, London, 1877; S. M. Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, 4 vols., Philadelphia, 1859–67; idem, *Memoirs*, ib. 1881; idem, *Life of William Penn*, ib. 1882; R. Barclay, *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, 3d ed., London, 1879; A. C. Applegarth, *Quakers in Pennsylvania*, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, ser. 10, nos. 8, 9, Baltimore, 1892; I. Sharpless, *A Quaker Experiment in Government*, Philadelphia, 1902; idem, *Quakerism and Politics*, ib. 1905; J. Bellows, *Letters and Memoirs*, London, 1904; T. E. Harvey, *Rise of the Quakers*, ib. 1905; A. C. and R. H. Thomas, *Hist. of Friends in America*, Philadelphia, 1905; J. Rowntree, *Essays and Addresses*, London, 1906.

On the Doctrines of the Friends consult: Robert Barclay, *Theologiæ veræ Christianiæ apologia*, Amsterdam, 1676, Eng. transl., *Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (Aberdeen?), 1678, reprinted Philadelphia, 1855; W. and T. Evans, *The Friends' Library*, 14 vols., ib. 1837–50; E. Bates, *The Doctrines of the Friends*, London, 1843; J. J. Gurney, *Observations on Distinguishing Views and Practice of Friends*, ib. 1859; *Book of Christian Discipline of Society of Friends*, ib. 1883 (compiled from the documents of the yearly meetings, 1672–1883); J. M. DeGarmo, *Hicksite Quakers and their Doctrines*, New York, 1897; J. Rowntree, *Society of Friends; its Faith and Practice*, London, 1901; R. M. Jones, *Social Law in the Spiritual World*, Philadelphia, 1905.

FRIENDS OF THE TEMPLE: An organization which originated in Germany for the setting up of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth according to the Law and the Prophets, with its capital in Jerusalem. The founder, Christoph Hoffmann, was born at Leonberg Dec. 2, 1815, as the son of the burgomaster G. W. Hoffmann and younger brother of the future court preacher Wilhelm Hoffmann (q.v.). The impressions which he early received at Kornthal (q.v.), his father's foundation, were decisive of his future career, and he regarded his own work as the fulfilment of his father's plans. His theological training was largely along lines of his own choosing, and the lack of a scientific knowledge of the Scriptures was always obvious in him. His course was determined by the conception of the kingdom of Christ on earth as set forth in the writings of P. M. Hahn (q.v.); and his marriage to Hahn's granddaughter brought him into connection with the Paulus brothers, in whose educational work he assisted until 1853. He came out against the conventional Christianity of his time in his *21 Sätze gegen Gottesleugner* (Ludwigsburg, 1844) and other writings of the kind; and he carried his campaign further in the periodical published by him in conjunction with Paulus, the *Süddeutsche Warte* (called after 1877 *Warte des Tempels*). In the eventful year 1848 he was elected for the Ludwigsburg district to the Frankfort Assembly, in which he voted with the Left for the complete separation of Church and State; but, dissatisfied with the way things were going, he resigned his seat the next year, giving utterance to his views in *Stimmen der Weissagung über Babel und das Volk Gottes* (1849). If the Church was to fulfil its mission of renewing the national life, it must itself be revivified; and this was the purpose of the Evangelischer Verein, founded in 1848 and composed of about 450 local branches, and of a school of evangelists under Hoffmann's direction, the lay preachers trained in which were to put new life into Pietism. It was not long before his peculiar ideas began to come out strongly—social regeneration through the "assembling of God's people" with a central point, the Temple, conceived partly in a spiritual sense, and partly in a realistic as involving the restoration of the Temple and the theocracy at Jerusalem. With these views, it was natural that Hoffmann should stand apart from the Inner Mission, which arose at the same time, and ultimately from the Church. With his followers he left the Evangelischer Verein, and at the same time turned his back on Pietism, whose leaders, in their predominantly eschatological conception of the kingdom of God, declared decidedly against his views and forbade their members to read the *Warte*. He gained a vigorous ally, however, in Georg David Hardegg of Ludwigsburg, who aided him to assemble there (Aug. 24, 1854) a gathering of the "Friends of Jerusalem." This body sent a petition to the Frankfort Assembly with 500 signatures, requesting it to bring pressure to bear on the sultan for the sanction of a settlement in Palestine. Since nothing came of this and similar efforts, Hoffmann undertook to build up the Temple in Germany. He wrote a projected constitution for the people of God, an appeal to Christians and Jews alike to support his project, and a book intended as a contribution to the social question, *Geschichte des Volkes Gottes* (Stuttgart, 1855). The first practical step was the purchase of a place near Marbach in 1856, which was intended to be a preliminary settlement on the road to Jerusalem. While his sympathizers settled there under regulations based on the Law and the Prophets, Hoffmann went, with Hardegg and Bubeck, to Palestine, and after a thorough investigation came to the conclusion that there was no use attempting the erection of the Temple until after much preliminary work.

The Founder.

Hoffmann was suspended from the privileges of a Lutheran candidate in 1857 by the Consistory, and then, refusing to give any satisfactory explanation of his attitude, formally expelled from the communion of the national Church in 1859. The next step was definite organization as a separate religious body, accomplished in 1861 in a gathering of sixty-four men at Kirschenhardthof, the headquarters. The Temple was to be governed provisionally by Hardegg as secular and Hoffmann as spiritual leader, with an advisory council of twelve elders. A constitutional election was first held in 1867. The movement spread in Franconia and especially in the Black Forest, until the number of adherents was estimated at 3,000.

Organization as a Sect.

Hoffmann was incessantly active in the organization of various departments at Kirschenhardthof, in lecturing (most frequently at Stuttgart), and most of all in the composition of his book *Fortschritt und Rückschritt, oder Geschichte des Abfalls vom Christenthum* (3 vols., Stuttgart, 1863–68). From 1861 to 1868, however, the real leadership of the movement was not in his hands but in Hardegg's. He was a fanatical dreamer, and Hoffmann was forced into an antagonism to him which gradually became apparent. Hoffmann even thought for a time of resigning the whole charge into his hands and seeking to realize his own views in America.

Colonization in Palestine.

In 1868 they made an attempt to settle in Palestine, the first settlement being at Haifa near Mount Carmel, where Hardegg remained while Hoffmann migrated to Jaffa the next year, founding there a school and a hospital. The acquisition of a tract of ground in the plain of Resaim near Jerusalem in 1873 marked an important advance; and smaller settlements arose at Nazareth, Tiberias, Beirut, Ramleh, and other places, including Alexandria. About 1,500 colonists in all took up their abode in these places. In 1874 occurred an open breach between the two leaders. Hardegg went his way, founded an organization of his own (the Temple Union), and died in 1879. Hoffmann now founded an inner brotherhood for the strict carrying out of his principles, and in 1878 transferred his headquarters to Jerusalem. He gradually broke more and more with orthodoxy, contesting many of its fundamental doctrines and leaving the use of the sacraments wholly voluntary. His pen was still busy; *Occident und Orient* (Stuttgart, 1875) is a noteworthy production of this period. A definite constitution was drawn up in 1875, and replaced by another in 1879. Hoffmann was forced by infirmity to resign his leadership in 1884, and died Dec. 8, 1885. At that time there were 1,300 colonists in the East, and in 1901 1,406. Another new constitution, promulgated in 1890 and since then little modified, placed the rule in the hands of the "Guardian of the Temple" (from 1893 Christoph Hoffmann, Jr., the founder's son), and prescribed very simple rites, requiring unconditional obedience to the governing body. But with Hoffmann's death the movement lost its stimulus. A new colony was founded in Palestine in 1903; there is one community in Württemberg (with a diminishing number of members—244 in 1905), and a few adherents are found in Saxony, in Russia, and in America [in the United States in 1905, four churches with 340 members]. Among the colonists in Palestine divisions have occurred, which an attempt at reunion in 1897 did not fully reconcile. A number of them have shown a tendency to return to the Lutheran Church and accept its ministrations. The importance of the movement there to-day is to be found in its economic aspects, which now admittedly predominate, and in its support of German interests in the East. Hoffmann's curious mixture of supernatural and rationalistic, Judaizing and Christian, Pietistic and socialistic elements could never have served as the basis of a permanent structure; and in what he set out to do he may be said to have definitely failed.

(C. Kolb.)

Bibliography: F. Lange, *Geschichte des Tempels*, Stuttgart, 1899 (goes only to 1884); C. Palmer, *Gemeinschaften und Sekten*, Tübingen, 1877; *Württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1893; E. Kalb, *Kirchen und Sekten der Gegenwart*, ib. 1907 (the two last-named contain further literature). Hoffmann issued an autobiography under the title *Mein Weg nach Jerusalem*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1881–84.

FRIENDSHIP: A relation between men for the purpose of mutual support and furtherance, having its root in the natural instinct for association between those of like tastes, aims, and desires. It is to be distinguished from the communion of sexes, and from relations of authority [e.g., that between employer and employed]. As long as the individual was absorbed in the community, the realization of friendship was not possible. Since ancient Greek philosophy was guided by the tendency to secure for the individual his personal value in opposition to the community, without finding the right ethical basis for mutual relations, it naturally esteemed friendship, especially between men of like philosophical training. Owing to their deficient appreciation of the moral value of married life, Greeks like Socrates and Theophrastus even went so far as to give friendship the precedence over every other form of love.

In modern times speculation on friendship has been less prominent, because in Christianity friendships arise everywhere as a matter of course. Christianity prepared an entirely new soil for friendship. While in the Aristotelian conception of *philia* and in Cicero's *amicitia* the general ethical sense of communion is confused with the special idea of friendship, in Christianity both are clearly separated. The former has been purified and perfected in the love of one's neighbor (*philadelphia*, II Pet. i. 7); still higher must be ranked the union of the saved children of God (John xiii. 34, xvii. 21), as being in its spiritual and moral content superior to all conceptions of the pre-Christian world. While, moreover, the ancient world considered friendship the highest form of communion, because it did not estimate the moral personality of woman and the moral value of married life, Christianity, by placing woman on an equal footing with man in a religious and moral aspect, showed in married life a natural form of communion far superior to every kind of friendship in intimacy, satisfaction of the soul, and permanence. But since Christianity appreciates every just natural instinct, and purifies it ethically, it acknowledges the right of the natural relations of friendship as long as they do not interfere with the moral obligations in family, Church, and State.

The purpose of friendship has been variously stated. According to Socrates and the Stoics, it is profit; according to Aristotle, profit, pleasure, and virtue; according to Epicurus, the purpose is profit, the consequence enjoyment. Cicero more correctly put the natural impulse which binds men to men before a conscious striving for profit, although he would have done still better, had he said want and need instead of natural impulse. Friendships

flourish best in the period of youth because then the need for help from outside oneself is strongest. There are sentimental friendships based on like impressions and feelings; esthetic friendships, like that between Goethe and Schiller (cf. their interchange of letters); and scientific friendships, between men of like vocation. The highest form of friendship is the religious, in which the Christian's love of his fellow man unites with natural sympathy differing and yet like-minded individualities, because there is developed here the deepest intimacy, sincerity and truth of spiritual communion in connection with the most devoted sense of sacrifice.

(L. Lemme.)

Bibliography: Cicero and R. W. Emerson, *Friendship; two Essays*, New York, 1904; H. Black, *Friendship*, ib. 1904; F. L. Knowles, *Value of Friendship*, Boston, 1904; H. D. Thoreau, *Essay on Friendship*, East Aurora, N. Y., 1904; M. A. Ayer, *Joys of Friendship*, Boston, 1905; Aristotle, *Ethics*, good Eng. transl., ed. J. Burnet, London, 1904.

FRISIANS: A people of Germanic stock dwelling along the coast of the North Sea from the Sinkfal, a tributary of the Scheldt, to the lower courses of the Weser, with an outlying spur (the North Frisians) on the western coast of Sleswick-Holstein. Their neighbors to the north and east were the Saxons, and to the south and west the Franks. With the latter they came into close contact, and accordingly as the Frankish influence advanced or receded the influence of Christianity rose or waned among the Frisian tribes, their conversion remaining uncompleted until the final incorporation of their territory by the Frankish empire. Mission work was begun among the Frisians in the early part of the seventh century but was followed by a pagan reaction which wiped out all traces of the new faith. The process of permanent conversion may be dated from the year 678 when Archbishop Wilfrid of York (q.v.), cast away on the Frisian coast, was hospitably received by King Aldgild at whose court he remained during the winter preaching and baptizing. It was, however, a pupil of Wilfrid, Willibrord, who came to Friesland in 690, who deserves the name of apostle of the Frisians (see Willibrord). At the time of his advent the successor of Aldgild was engaged in conflict with the Frankish king Pepin, and Willibrord was compelled to restrict his labors to that part of the region south of the Rhine which was under the Frankish power. There his efforts met with pronounced success and in 695 the Frisian territory as far as the river Fly was organized into an archbishopric of which Willibrord became the first head. Till his death in 739 he was busy in perfecting the organization of the church, interrupted only by a short period when the Frisian King Radbord, in conjunction with the forces of Neustria succeeded in wresting the conquered territory from the Franks (714–718), only to lose it to Charles Martel. Under the immediate successors of Willibrord the mission failed to make decisive progress in the region beyond the Fly and it was not until 785 that the Frisians were brought entirely under the influence of the Gospel. Politically the western Frisians came under the authority of the counts of Holland and from them passed to the houses of Burgundy and Hapsburg, while the eastern Frisians after dwelling for a long time as a league of independent communities finally chose a common ruler, who in the reign of Emperor Frederick III. became count of East Friesland. The Reformation plunged Friesland into a protracted conflict between the Lutheran and Reformed tendencies which had made their way into the country from lower Saxony and Belgium and Holland respectively, a conflict in which the two parties showed themselves matched with sufficient evenness to prevent the establishment of a church organization of either type. In 1599 a concordat was concluded by which the two confessions were both recognized as the legitimate offspring of the Augsburg Confession and the control of church affairs was vested in a consistory comprising representatives of both parties. The principles of the concordat, however, were not carried into effect. In 1643 a consistory was organized of an exclusively Lutheran character, but it was antagonized by the ruling body of the Reformed Church. Full equality between the two denominations was established by the law of Dec. 12, 1882, when the Reformed churches of Friesland together with those of the counties of Bentheim and Plesse were united into the ecclesiastical province of Hanover under the authority of a consistory at Aurich established in 1884.

(G. Uhlhorn†.)

Bibliography: T. D. Wiarda, *Ostfriesische Geschichte*, 10 vols., ib. 1792–1817; C. A. Cornelius, *Der Antheil Ostfrieslands an der Reformation*, Münster, 1852; P. Claessens, *Éclaircissements sur l'établissements des évêchés dans les Pays-Bas*, Louvain, 1859; W. Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland*, Arnhem, 1864–71; W. T. Hewett, *Frisian Language and Literature*, New York, 1879; P. G. Bartels, *Zur Geschichte des ostfriesischen Konsistoriums*, Aurich, 1885; P. J. Blok, *Friesland im Mittelalter*, Leer, 1891; W. E. Collins, *Early Hist. of Frisia*, London, 1891 (on the conversion of Frisia); Hofstede de Groot, *Hundert Jahre aus der Reformation der Niederlande*, Gütersloh, 1893; P. Blom, *Geschiedenis van Oud-Friesland*, Leeuwarden, 1900; Rettberg, *KD;* Hauck, *KD*, i. 295 sqq., 393 sqq., 541 sqq., ii. 310 sqq.; *KL*, iv. 2049–56.

FRISSELL, HOLLIS BURKE: Presbyterian; b. at Amenia, N. Y., July 14, 1851. He was graduated at Yale in 1874 and Union Theological Seminary in 1879. After being assistant pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, for a few months in 1880, he was appointed chaplain of Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., remaining there in that capacity until 1893, when he was appointed to his present position of principal.

FRITH (FRYTH), JOHN: English Reformer; b. at Westerham (19 m. s.e. of London) 1503; d. at London July 4, 1533. He was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1525), but immediately after taking his degree he became a junior canon of Cardinal College (now Christ Church), Oxford, his patron being Cardinal Wolsey. In the same year he met Tyndale in London, and aided him in his translation of the New Testament. With several friends he was imprisoned in his college for teaching the doctrines of the Reformers. He was released, however, at the instance of Wolsey, on condition that he should remain within ten miles of Oxford, but he went to Germany, spending the most of his time at Marburg. After living on the Continent about four years, during which time he

married, he returned to England and went to Reading. There he was set in the stocks as a vagrant, but was released at the request of the schoolmaster of the town and went to London, where Sir Thomas More, the lord chancellor, issued a warrant for his arrest as a heretic. Frith sought concealment, but was seized at Milton Shore, Essex, as he was attempting to escape to Holland, and was committed to the Tower. His imprisonment was not rigid, however, and became still milder when Sir Thomas Audley became chancellor in 1533. Meanwhile Frith had formulated his views on the sacrament, holding the following four points: The doctrine of the sacrament is not an article of faith to be held under pain of damnation; the natural body of Christ had the same qualities as those of all men, except that it was free from sin, and it is therefore not ubiquitous; it is neither right nor necessary to take the word of Christ literally, for it should be construed according to the analogy of the Bible; the sacrament should be received according to the institution of Christ, and not according to the order in use. A tailor named William Holt obtained a statement of these views from Frith by pretending to be his friend, and gave a copy to More, who prepared a reply, of which the prisoner managed to secure a written copy. He immediately wrote a refutation, but was attacked by one of the royal chaplains in a sermon before the king. Henry VIII. ordered him to be examined, and he was accordingly tried, refusing a proffered opportunity to escape. He again appeared before the bishops of London, Winchester, and Chichester on June 20, 1533, but as he persisted in his denial of transubstantiation and purgatory, Bishop Stokesley of London condemned him to die at the stake as an obstinate heretic. Frith was therefore delivered to the secular arm and was confined in Newgate until he was taken to Smithfield for execution.

John Frith was a prolific writer, his chief works being *Fruitful Gatherings of Scripture* (n.p., 1529 [?]; a translation of the *Loci* of Patrick Hamilton); *A Pistle to the Christen Reader; the Revelation of Anti-Christ* (Marburg, 1529; one of the first English attacks on Roman Catholicism); *A Disputation of Purgatory* (Marburg [?] 1531 [?]); *A Letter unto faithful Followers of Christ's Gospel* (n.p., 1532 [?]); *A Mirror or Glass to Know thyself* (1532 [?]); *A Mirror or Looking Glass wherein you may behold the Sacrament of Baptism described* (London, 1533); and *The Articles wherefore John Frith he died* (1548). Frith's complete works were edited, together with those of Tyndale and Barnes, by John Foxe at London in 1573. To him are also ascribed the *Vox Piscis* (3 parts, London, 1626–27), containing three brief treatises, including the *Mirror or Glass to Know thyself*, all said to have been found in a codfish in Cambridge market in 1626; *An Admonition or Warning that the faithful Christians in London &c. may avoid God's Vengeance* (Wittenberg, 1554) and the *Testament of Master W Trocie, Esquire* (Antwerp, 1535), Tyndale being a collaborator in the latter work.

Bibliography: *Life and Martyrdom of John Frith*, London, 1824; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P Bliss, i. 74, London, 1813; *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, ed. C. H. and T. Cooper, i. 47, ib. 1858; T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain*, ed. J. S. Brewer, iii. 85, Oxford, 1845; *DNB*, xx. 278–280.

FRITZSCHE, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH: Reformed theologian; b. in Nauendorf (10 m. n. of Halle) Aug. 17, 1776; d. at Zurich Oct. 18, 1850. He studied in the Latin school of the Halle orphan asylum and entered the University of Leipsic in 1792; in 1799 he became pastor in Steinbach and Lauterbach near Borna, and in 1809 preacher and superintendent at Dobrilugk. He took a warm interest in the public schools and wrote monographs and articles on the theological questions of the time from the supernaturalistic point of view. When he became too deaf to preach he was made honorary professor of theology at Halle in 1827, ordinary professor in 1830; and held the position till 1848. His writings were collected in two volumes of *Opuscula academica* (Leipsic, 1838, and Zurich, 1846). (O. F Fritzsche†.)

Bibliography: C. W Spieker, *Aus dem Leben des C. F. Brescius*, Frankfort, 1845; *Aus den Briefen von C. F. Brescius an C. F. Fritzsche*, von O. F. Fritzsche in *ZKG*, xiv. 214–240.

FRITZSCHE, KARL FRIEDRICH AUGUST: German exegete, son of Christian Friedrich Fritzsche (q.v.); b. at Steinbach, near Borna (15 m. s.s.e. of Leipsic), Dec. 16, 1801; d. at Giessen Dec. 6, 1846. He was educated from 1814 to 1820 at the Thomas-school in Leipsic and then studied theology at the same place. In 1825 he became professor on the philosophical faculty. In 1826 he went as professor of theology to Rostock, and in 1841 to Giessen. His theological views were rationalistic, and he concentrated his efforts chiefly upon the exegesis of the Bible, especially of the New Testament. Biblical exegesis in the second decade of the nineteenth century was at a low ebb. The prevailing conception of language was purely empirical; general laws were deduced from superficial investigations, and by confounding the meaning and sense of words the most different and contradictory interpretations were often justified; there was no trace of a penetration into the fundamental spirit of language. Exegesis had become the vehicle of dogmatics, and everything displeasing was simply explained away from the Bible. The reform of these conditions in the sphere of philology was started by the Rostock philologist Gottfried Hermann, and it was transferred to Biblical literature by Winer and Fritzsche. The strictly grammatical method of Bible study was first introduced by Winer in his *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Leipsic, 1822), and Fritzsche was one of the most industrious contributors to the later emendations and editions of this work. He paid special attention to the linguistic element in exegesis; textual criticism was one of his favorite occupations. His most important works are: *De nonnullis posterioris Pauli ad Corinthios epistolæ locis dissertationes duæ* (1823–24) and his commentaries on Matthew (1826), Mark (1830), and the Epistle to the Romans (3 parts, Halle, 1836–43). Some of his miscellaneous writings have been collected in *Fritzschiorum opuscula academico* (Leipsic, 1838). Against the purely diplomatic method which Lach-

mann applied to the New Testament he wrote *De conformatione Novi Testamenti critica, quam C. Lachmannus edidit, commentatio I* (Giessen, 1841).

(O. F FRITZSCHE†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Knobel, *Grabrede*, Giessen, 1847; *Allgemeine Zeitung für Christenthum und Kirche*, 1847, no. 2; *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung*, 1847, no. 26.

FRITZSCHE, OTTO FRIDOLIN: German theologian, youngest son of Christian Friedrich Fritzsche; b. at Dobrilugk (66 m. s.s.w. of Frankfort), Prussia, Sept. 23, 1812; d. at Zurich Mar. 9, 1896. He studied at Halle and became privat-docent there in 1836, but in 1837 was called as professor of theology to the University of Zurich, where he was active in his official capacity until 1893. In 1837 he was also made librarian in the theological department of the library of the canton and in 1844 chief librarian of the same library. He lectured on New Testament exegesis and church history and wrote valuable books in these fields. His exegesis is based on the new principles in linguistic research advocated by Gottfried Hermann, his older brother Karl Friedrich August Fritzsche (q.v.) and Winer. His text editions contain extensive collections of different readings and critical introductions; his edition of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament (Leipsic, 1871) is the most comprehensive and important. Notwithstanding some objections that may be raised, it is the best edition now in existence. Its chief merit lies in the collection and systematic utilization of the material collected by Holmes and Parsons for the "Oxford Septuagint" (5 vols., 1789–1827; see BIBLE VERSIONS, A, I.), to which Fritzsche added the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the fragments of the *Codex Ephraemi*, while for Sirach, Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, and the additions in Daniel he unfortunately did not compare the *Codex Vaticanus*. At the end of this text edition there are to be found some of the so-called Pseudepigrapha—the Psalms of Solomon, the Fourth and Fifth Books of Ezra, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Ascension of Moses. The Pseudepigrapha were also published separately (1871). Fritzsche also edited the double text of the Greek translation of the Book of Esther with the Greek additions (1848–49), the Greek translation of the Book of Ruth (1864) and of the Book of Judges (1866–67). Other publications belonging in the same category are—*Probe einer kritischen Ausgabe der alten lateinischen Uebersetzung des Neuen Testamentes* (1867), which consists of the text of the first five chapters of the Gospel of Luke; and the edition of the fragments of the old Latin translation of the Book of Judges as an appendix to the above-mentioned edition of the Greek translation of the Book of Judges. Of text editions belonging to the sphere of church history may be mentioned—*Der Brief des Clemens an Jakobus in der lateinischen Uebersetzung des Rufinus* (1873); *Die Werke des Lactantius* (1842); *Theodors von Mopsuestia exegetische Schriften zum Neuen Testament samt den Fragmenten seiner Schrift: "De incarnatione filii Dei"* (1847); Anselm of Canterbury's *Cur deus homo* (3d. ed., 1893); *Confessio Helvetica posterior* (1839). He also prepared a biography of the Zurich theologian Johann Jakob Zimmermann (1841) and *Glareanus, sein Leben und seine Schriften* (1890). His principal work in exegesis is the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes* (6 vols., 1851–60), which he wrote with Willibald Grimm. It is still the best commentary on the Old Testament apocrypha. The first, second and fifth volumes are the work of Fritzsche; they comprise the third book of Ezra, the additions to Esther and Daniel, the Prayer of Manasseh, the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah in the first volume, the books of Tobit and Judith in the second and the book of Jesus Sirach in the fifth volume.

(VICTOR RYSSEL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: V. Ryssel, in *Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz*, 1896, pp. 108–123; Steiner, in *Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz*, 1887.

FROESCHEL, frō'shel, **SEBASTIAN:** German Protestant; b. at Amberg (35 m. e. of Nuremberg), Bavaria, Feb. 24, 1497; d. at Wittenberg Dec. 20, 1570. From 1514 till 1519 he studied at Leipsic, when he heard the disputation between Luther and Eck in the latter year and received an impression therefrom which proved decisive for his subsequent career. Ordained deacon in 1520, and priest in 1521, he soon came into conflict with the Roman Church, and, as a result, removed to Wittenberg in the autumn of 1522. While on a visit to Leipsic in Oct., 1523, he preached a series of sermons, which led to his arrest and expulsion from the country as a heretic. After a short ministry at Halle he returned to Wittenberg in 1525 as assistant to Bugenhagen. During the remainder of his life he served the church at Wittenberg, becoming deacon there in 1528, and later archdeacon. He was on terms of intimacy with both Luther and Melanchthon. From 1542 to 1566 he frequently assisted in the ordination of foreign ministers at Wittenberg. In his writings he appears as the interpreter of Melanchthon. He published a Latin commentary on St. Matthew (Wittenberg, 1558; Germ. transl., 1559; reprinted in *CR*, xiv. 535–1042); *Catechismus* (1559; 2d. ed., 1560); *Von den heiligen Engeln, vom Teufel, und des Menschen Seele* (1563); *Von der Passion Christi* (1565); *Vom Priestertum* (1565); and *Vom Königreich Christi* (1566).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. C. Erdmann, *Biographie sämmtlicher Pastoren . zu Wittenberg*, p. 11 and Supplement, pp. 55–62, Wittenberg, 1801–08; J. C. Seidemann, *Die Leipziger Disputation in 1519*, pp. 132–134, Dresden, 1843; G. Buchwald, *Zur Wittenberger Stadt- und Universität-Geschichte*, Leipsic, 1893.

FROMENT, frō''mān', **ANTOINE:** One of the men who introduced the Reformation in Geneva; b. at Mens (25 m. s. of Grenoble), in Dauphiné, 1508; d. in Geneva Nov. 6, 1581. From 1529 he accompanied Guillaume Farel, the pioneer of the Reformed faith and preached the Gospel in western Switzerland. On Nov. 3, 1532, he went to Geneva, where the Evangelicals were still few and timid. He opened a school, and advertised that "a man had come who within a month would teach every one, men and women, great and small, to read French and to write, even if they had never been to school"; if any one did not learn in that space of time, he should have nothing to pay; also

he would heal many sicknesses gratuitously. Froment was a capital teacher; he used the Bible as a text-book and crowds of people, old and young, came to him. On New Year's Day, 1533, so many wished to hear him that he was compelled to preach in the market-place. Taking Matt. vii. 15–16 as his text, he criticized the pope, the monks, and the priests as false prophets and denounced their shameful living. He was soon obliged to depart from Geneva, but when the Protestant party became stronger and was supported by Bern he came back (July 1533). The bishop of Geneva, Pierre de la Baume, had just left the city. Froment resumed his Evangelistic work with great success. The Roman Catholic party called a popular preacher, Guy Furbity, a doctor of divinity of the Sorbonne, as Advent preacher. When he spoke violently of the new doctrine in a sermon Froment answered in the church of St. Pierre. A great tumult followed and once more Froment was compelled to leave Geneva. Bern took offense at Furbity's preaching and threatened to break its alliance with Geneva if an apology was not made (Jan., 1534). Froment and Viret came back with the Bernese deputies. The government of Geneva gave way and the Reformation made steady progress. After Mar., 1534, Froment went to the Waldenses in Piedmont and Dauphiné. In 1535 he was in Geneva when the priests, it is alleged, induced a female servant to give a poisoned soup to the Reformers, of which fortunately neither Farel nor Froment partook, but Viret was taken very seriously ill. Meantime Protestantism gained so much ground that the majority of the citizens favored the new doctrine. In Aug., 1535, the mass was abolished and the Reformation practically established. Froment ministered for a time in the Bernese province of Chablais and was deacon at Thonon, but he was busier as a merchant than as a pastor. Then his wife, Marie Dentière of Tournai, a former abbess, became unfaithful to him, and he had to resign his charge. He acted for a time as secretary to Bonivard, the former prior of St. Victor and prisoner of Chillon, then (Dec. 31, 1552) he was appointed notary. In 1562 he was put in prison and banished, being convicted of unchastity. For ten years the old man led a poor and miserable life; at last he was allowed to come back to Geneva (1572) and even to resume his place as notary (1574). His most notable work is: *Les Actes et gestes merveilleux de la cité de Genève* (ed. G. Revilliod, Geneva, 1854), a chronicle of the years 1532–36, very interesting, but not always accurate.

EUGÈNE CHOISY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. Henri Bordier, vol. v., Paris, 1886; A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des réformateurs*, 9 vols., Geneva, 1866–97; A. Guillot, *Les Débuts de la Réformation à Genève*, Geneva, 1885.

FRONTON, frōn″tōn′, **DU DUC** (also **Fronton le Duc**; Lat. *Fronto Ducæus*): A learned Roman Catholic writer; b. at Bordeaux 1558; d. in Paris Sept. 25, 1624. He was a son of a councilor of the parliament of Bordeaux, entered the Society of Jesus in 1577, and acted as teacher at Pont-à-Mousson, Bordeaux, and Paris, where he became librarian of the College of Clermont in 1604. A friend of Casaubon and very well known as a Greek scholar, he revised the text of the works of the Greek Fathers and translated them into Latin, with the addition of notes (*Bibliotheca patrum græco-latina*, 2 vols., Paris, 1624). He also wrote three volumes against Du Plessis-Mornay's book on the Eucharist (Bordeaux, 1599–1602).

EUGÈNE CHOISY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Nicéron, *Mémoires*, xxxviii. 103; A. and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la société de Jésus*, iii. 233, 7 vols., Liége, 1853–61; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius recentioris theologiæ catholicæ*, i. 330, Innsbruck, 1892.

FROSSARD, frŏs″sär′, **BENJAMIN SIGISMOND:** French Protestant; b. at Nyon (14 m. n. of Geneva), Switzerland, 1754; d. at Montauban (110 m. s.e. of Bordeaux) Jan. 3, 1830. He studied theology at Geneva and in 1777 became pastor of the Reformed Church at Lyons, where he remained till the siege of the city in 1793. While visiting England in 1785 he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Oxford. In 1795 he became professor of morals in the École Centrale of Clermont-Ferrand. Later he went to Paris, became a member of the consistory there, and collaborated with Rabaut-Pommier in the preparation of the organic articles of the Reformed worship. In 1809 he was charged with the organization of a Protestant theological faculty in Montauban, where he became pastor and president of the consistory. In 1810 he became the first dean of the new faculty and professor of morals and sacred eloquence. The reaction of 1815 deprived him of both deanship and pastorate, though he retained his professorship. His chief publications are a translation of Hugh Blair's sermons (3 vols., Lyons, 1782); *La Cause des esclaves nègres et des habitants de la Guinée* (2 vols., 1789); and *Le Christianisme des gens du monde mis en opposition avec le véritable Christianisme* (2 vols., Montauban, 1831), a translation of Wilberforce's *Practical View*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 345–346, Paris, 1878, where sources are indicated.

FROTHINGHAM, OCTAVIUS BROOKS: Rationalist; b. in Boston Nov. 26, 1822; d. there Nov. 27, 1895. He was graduated at Harvard in 1843, and at the divinity school in 1846. He filled charges at Salem, Mass. (1847–55), Jersey City (1855–59), and New York City (1859–79), resigned on account of ill health in 1879, and after 1881 lived in Boston. He founded the Free Religious Association (q.v.) in 1867 and was its president till 1878. He was noted for eloquence and scholarship, but was extreme in his religious views. His New York church was originally called The Third Unitarian but it separated from that denomination in 1874 and was called The Independent Liberal Church of New York. He published lives of *Theodore Parker* (Boston, 1874), *Gerritt Smith* (New York, 1878), *George Ripley* (Boston, 1882), and *William Henry Channing* (1886); *The Religion of Humanity* (New York, 1873); *A History of Transcendentalism in New England* (1876); *Boston Unitarianism, 1820–50*, a study of the life and work of his father, Nathaniel Langdon Frothingham (1890).

FROUDE, frūd, RICHARD HURRELL: The English theologian remembered chiefly for his connection with the beginning of the Oxford Movement, and brother of James Anthony Froude, the historian; b. at Dartington (2 m. n. of Totnes), Devonshire, Mar. 25, 1803; d. there Feb. 28, 1836. He was educated at Eton and at Oxford (B.A., 1824; M.A., 1827). In 1826 he won a fellowship at Oriel, of which he was also tutor from 1827 to 1830. He took deacon's orders in 1828 and priest's in 1829; but symptoms of consumption soon appeared, and he was obliged to pass a large part of the few years that remained to him in the south of Europe and the West Indies. Though he died at such an early age, his force of intellect and character made a deep impression on all who knew him. and contributed not a little to influence the course of the Oxford Movement. Thomas Mozley, who was intimately associated with the whole group of men, says of these early days (*Reminiscences*, i., London, 1882, p. 225) that "if there could ever be any question as to the master spirit of this movement it lies between John Henry Newman and Richard Hurrell Froude." He wrote three of the *Tracts for the Times*, and contributed to the *Lyra Apostolica* the charming verses signed β. Two volumes of his *Remains* were published in 1837, with a preface by Newman. See TRACTARIANISM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the Life prefixed to the *Remains:* J. H. Newman, *Apologia*, pp. 75, 77, 84–87, 95, 109–110, et passim, London, 1864; T. Mozley, *Reminiscences*, i. 224–228, 291–305, ib. 1882; J. B. Mozley's *Letters*, pp. 75, 102, ib. 1884; *DNB*, xx. 290–291.

FRUCTUOSUS OF BRAGA: Archbishop of Braga and apostle to the Suevi and Lusitani; d. about 665. He was of royal stock, but retired to monastic life at an early age. After completing his education at a school founded by the bishop of Palencia, he sold his estates and devoted the proceeds partly to the poor and partly to the establishment of cloisters. By 647 he had founded seven monasteries in Lusitania, Asturia, Galicia, and the island of Gades, but, instead of assuming the direction he retired to solitude, where his scholars from Complutum (not the well-known town of that name, the modern Alcala, but a place apparently in northwestern Leon, or, according to others, in Asturia), sought him out and induced him to take charge of their monastery. Such was the growth of the cloister that the king forbade any except women to join it, fearing that the number of men available for military service would be depleted, whereupon Fructuosus built a nunnery for about eighty virgins who chose him for their spiritual head. He is best known, however, through the two rules which he drew up for his monks. The first of these, based in part on the Benedictine rule and designed for the cloister of Complutum (whence it is known as the *Regula Complutensis*), is divided into twenty-five sections and inculcates the most implicit and detailed obedience on the part of the monks. In the second rule (*Regula communis*) the problem of double monastic life is considered, so that husbands might live with their wives and children in monastic purity. Here again absolute submission to the abbot was required, family ties were completely dissolved, and the sexes were rigidly separated, although a few aged monks of proved morality were permitted to reside in nunneries at a distance from the cells of the sisters, to exercise supervision over them. No one was permitted to enter a monastery, moreover, unless he first renounced all his wealth in favor of the poor.

Despite the aspeticism of Fructuosus, he was obliged to enter upon high ecclesiastical office. He was planning to make a pilgrimage to the East when he was consecrated bishop of Dumio in Galicia, and in 656 the Synod of Toledo elevated him to the archbishopric of Braccara (Braga). Throughout his life he was unwearied in the erection of monasteries and churches, and after his death many miracles were ascribed to his body, which was buried at Santiago de Compostella. He is still honored as the patron saint of many churches, especially in Spain. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita*, by a contemporary, is in *ASB*, Apr., ii. 431–436, and *ASM*, ii. 581–590. Consult C. F. de T. Montalembert, *Les Moines d'occident*, ii. 221–226, 5 vols., Paris, 1860–77, Eng. transl., 7 vols., London, 1861–79; P. D. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, ii. 2, pp. 152–158, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1862–79; O. Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum*, pp. 378–381, Frankfort, 1897; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, v. 30–34.

FRUCTUOSUS OF TARRAGONA: Bishop of Tarragona and martyr; d. about 259. Little is known concerning his life, except the events connected with his martyrdom, which is said to have taken place in 259, during the reign of Valerian and Gallienus. At the command of Æmilianus, the presiding judge, Fructuosus, with his two deacons, Augurius and Eulogius, was taken from prison to the amphitheater, where all three were burned to death. The festival of Fructuosus is celebrated by the Roman Church on Jan. 21, St. Agnes' Day. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *ASB*, Jan., ii. 239–240; Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, hymn 6; E. Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniæ Christianæ*, nos. 57–58, Berlin, 1871. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv. 198, 645; P. D. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, i. 265 sqq., Regensburg, 1862; *DCB*, ii. 571–572; *KL*, iv. 2066–2067.

FRUIT-TREES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Cultivated Olive (§ 1).
The Wild Olive (§ 2).
The Fig (§ 3).
The Sycamore (§ 4).
The Mulberry, Almond, and Pomegranate (§ 5).
The Apple (§ 6).
The Date-palm (§ 7).

Olive- and fig-trees and grape-vines were cultivated in Palestine by the Canaanites long before the advent of the Israelites. In the old parable of Jotham (Judges ix. 7–15) these appear as the characteristic plants of the land. The olive-tree belongs to the cultivated plants of the Mediterranean region. Its habitat is south hither Asia, where it was early improved and made to yield paying crops. It requires calcareous soil and a mean temperature of 15° C. (60° F.), and must be protected against strong winds and excessive heat. In the earliest times the olive was cultivated throughout Palestine (Deut. xxviii. 48); and olive-oil has always been one of the chief products of the country (Deut. viii. 8; Joel i. 10; Amos iv. 9, etc.). The regions particularly rich in olives were

1. The Cultivated Olive.

the low plains of the coast, where the royal gardens were located (I Chron. xxvii. 28), the region of the bay of Akko (Deut. xxxiii. 24), and the shore of the Sea of Galilee (Josephus, *War*, II., xxi. 2). The export, especially to Egypt, was considerable (Hosea, xii. 1), likewise to Phenicia (Ezek. xxvii. 17; cf. I Kings v. 11). Olive orchards are planted with seedlings, which are then improved. The tree does not bear for ten years, and only after thirty years does it yield a full crop. On an average, there is a full yield every second year, and with good care, a half-crop in the intermediate years. The tree, according to Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, XVI., xliv. 90, XVII., xxx.), may live 200 years; and very old olive-trees may be seen in Palestine to-day. An old stump will continue to send up new stems, as if its vitality were indestructible. The oil is found not in the kernel of the stone but in the juicy flesh of the fruit, which ripens in September and October. The fruit is gathered when purple, before it gets black and overripe, as the oil has a much finer flavor then. Olives were eaten everywhere, either raw or pickled, after the bitter taste had been removed by allowing them to lie in brine. The finest oil was obtained by placing the bruised ripe olives in a basket and allowing them to drip without being pressed (Ex. xxix. 40, etc.). Such oil was used for the golden candlesticks and in the preparation of the holy anointing oil. Most of the olives were trodden and mashed in stone presses, just as were grapes (Mic. vi. 15; Joel ii. 24). Many such oil-presses are still seen in Palestine.

The wild olive, or oleaster (Rom. xi. 17 sqq.), which is also referred to in the Old Testament, but by a different name (I Kings vi. 23, 31, 33; Neh. viii. 15), must not be confused with the cultivated olive. This had short, broad leaves and thorny branches, and yielded an inferior quality of oil used only in the preparation of ointment. The wood, on the other hand, furnished good timber.

2. The Wild Olive.

The olive-tree, perennially green and always rejuvenating itself, was a favorite symbol of prosperity (Ps. lii. 8, cxxviii. 3; Jer. xi. 16); and the falling off of the leaves after a frost was typical of the early destruction of the wicked (Job xv. 33). In case the tree lost its branches, wild olive branches were grafted on the cultivated stock (Rom. xi. 17.) For the Orientals olives and olive-oil are necessities, and the failure of the olive crop is a national calamity (Amos. iv. 9; Hab. iii. 17; cf. II Kings iv. 2 sqq.).

The home of the fig-tree is likewise in hither Asia, and in ancient times it was planted throughout Palestine (Num. xiii. 23; Deut. viii. 8, etc.). It has a smooth trunk, gray bark, attains a height of fifteen to eighteen feet, and its dense foliage affords a splendid shade (I Kings iv. 25; II Kings xviii. 31; Micah iv. 4). It is noted for its vitality and its ability to thrive on any soil; though in Palestine its fruit is not particularly large. In the Old Testament three varieties of figs are distinguished: (1) *Bikkûrîm*, early figs that ripen in June; (2) *te'enim*, late figs, which begin to ripen in August, growing on branches that were forced in January; (3) *phaggim*, late figs, which, still green in the autumn, hang on the tree all winter and ripen in the spring, when the sap rises. It was such winter figs that Jesus expected to find on the leafy fig-tree as early as the Passover (Matt. xxi. 19). Figs are very nutritious, and are eaten both fresh and dried, in the latter case pressed into cakes (I Sam. xxv. 18; II Kings xx. 7). In antiquity the healing power of figs was generally known and prized (Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, XXIII., lxiii.; II Kings xx. 7).

3. The Fig.

The sycamore (*Ficus Sycomorus*), mentioned frequently in the Old Testament, is one of the commonest trees of ancient and modern Egypt, which was considered its habitat, hence Pliny speaks of it as *Ficus Ægyptia* (*Hist. nat.*, XIII., xiv; cf. Diodorus, i. 34; Ps. lxxviii. 47). It is common in Palestine and Syria (II Chron. i. 15), e.g., at Gaza, Jaffa, Ramleh and Beirut; and the present Haifa used to be called "the City of Sycamores" (Strabo, xvi. 758, etc.). It grows best on low ground, and was found, therefore, chiefly near the coast, in the valley of the Jordan, on the plains of lower Galilee, and in the Shephelah (I Kings x. 27; I Chron. xxvii. 28; Isa. ix. 10). It attains considerable size and height, and its wide-spreading branches, covered with beautiful green leaves, make a magnificent shade. The fruit is yellow, resembling the fig in appearance and odor, and has a sweetish, insipid taste (Strabo, xvii. 823). It was eaten by poor people; but, to be made edible, just before ripening the fruit had to be pierced so that a part of the juice could escape (Amos vii. 14; Theophrastus, *Hist. plantarum*, iv. 2). The wood is very durable, particularly in water, and serves chiefly for building purposes (Isa. ix. 10). In Egypt it was used for mummy cases.

4. The Sycamore.

The mulberry-tree is mentioned only in I Macc. vi. 34, unless Luke xvii. 6 refers to it. The white mulberry (*Morus alba*), now planted extensively on Mount Lebanon for silk-worms, was introduced into Palestine comparatively late. Before its advent, the black mulberry (*Morus nigra*) was cultivated, from the fruit of which an intoxicating drink was, and is still, made. The almond-tree (*Amygdalus communis*) grows wild in Afghanistan, Kurdistan, and Mesopotamia, but in hither Asia and Palestine it has been cultivated from remotest times (Gen. xliii. 11; Num. xvii. 8; Jer. i. 11; Eccles. xii. 5). It puts out its leaves as early as the end of January, before any of the other fruit-trees, and hence, perhaps, the Hebrew name *shaḳedh*, "the waking one." The pomegranate-tree (*Punica Granatum*) is indigenous to hither Asia; it was common, both wild and cultivated, in Egypt (Num. xx. 5), Arabia, Syria, and Palestine (Num. xiii. 23; Deut. viii. 8; I Sam. xiv. 2), and the frequent use of the name Rimmon as a place-name shows the prevalence of the tree in Canaan (Josh. xv. 32, xix. 13; Judges xx. 45). Pliny mentions eight varieties. In size and shape the pomegranate resembles an orange; it has a bright red color shining out from a yellow and white background, and is juicy and refreshing. From the juice a sort of fruit-wine is prepared (Cant. viii. 2; Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, XIV., xix.). With its

5. The Mulberry, Almond, and Pomegranate.

numerous cavities, each containing a kernel, it became the symbol of fruitfulness in ancient religious imagery. Hence its use in the Hebrew cult on the columns of the temples (I Kings vii. 20 sqq.; Jer. lii. 22–23) and on the robe of the priest (Ex. xxviii. 33).

6. The Apple.

It is fairly probable that the Hebrew word *tappuaḥ* refers to the apple (Prov. xxv. 11; Cant. ii. 3, vii. 8, viii. 5; Joel 1. 12). Names o cities compounded with *tappuaḥ* show that the fruit was frequently cultivated in Palestine. The pleasant odor receives special mention (Cant. vii. 8). However, it has often been denied that there were any apple-trees in Palestine in olden times, and the word has been interpreted as "quince" (cf. *PSBA*, XII., i. 4, 2 sqq.), or as "citron" (cf. Delitzsch, on Prov. xxv. 6), or as "apricot" (cf. H. B. Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, p. 294, London, 1884).

7. The Date-palm.

The date-tree (*Phœnix dactylifera*) belongs to subtropical vegetation. It requires sandy soil and a mean annual temperature of 21° to 23° C (70° F.). It thrives on the scorching breath of the desert; but at the same time its thirsty roots must have water. It grows slowly, reaching its maximum height of about fifty feet in about 100 years, and lives to the age of about 200 years. The fruit is eaten fresh, or it is pressed into a cake and then dried, as are apricots. In Jericho a kind of sirup was also made of dates (Josephus, *War*. IV., viii. 3; Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, XIII., ix.). Its cultivation in Palestine as a fruit-tree was restricted to the plains by the Sea of Galilee, the valley of the Jordan, and the region of the Dead Sea, where it thrived, as these were the localities offering the proper conditions. Jericho bore the name, "City of Palm-trees" (Deut. xx., xiv. 3; II Chron. xxviii. 15). In other parts of the country the tree was cultivated as an ornament, and in the temple pictures of palm-trees were employed extensively as decoration (I Kings vi. 29 sqq.; Ezek. xl. 17 sqq., xli. 18 sqq.).

I. Benzinger.

Bibliography: G. E. Post, *The Flora of Syria, Palestine, and Sinai*, obtainable of the PEF, is the best single work. Consult: H. B. Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, London, 1884; Maria Callcott, *Scripture Herbal*, ib. 1842; H. S. Osborn, *Plants of the Holy Land; with their Fruits and Flowers*, Philadelphia, 1860; Auderlind, *Fruchtbäume in Syrien*, in *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina Vereins*, xi (1888), 69 sqq.; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, Berlin, 1894.

FRUMENTIUS. See Abyssinia and the Abyssinian Church, § 2.

FRY, ELIZABETH: English philanthropist, belonging to the Society of Friends; b. at Earlham (3 m. w. of Norwich), Norfolk, May 21, 1780; d. at Ramsgate (on the coast, 67 m. e.s.e. of London) Oct. 12, 1845. She was the third daughter of John Gurney, a banker of Norwich, and at the age of twenty was married to Joseph Fry, a wealthy London merchant. At the death of her father, in 1809, she spoke for the first time in public, and was soon recognized as a minister among the Friends. Her attention being drawn in 1813, by a report of Friends, to the wretched condition of criminals in the jails, she visited the prison at Newgate, and found nearly 300 women with their children crowded together in two wards and two cells, all sleeping on the bare floor. She at once instituted measures for the amelioration of prison morals and life, daily visiting the prison, reading to the prisoners the Scriptures, and teaching them to sew. A committee of women was organized in 1817 to carry on the work on a larger scale. These labors effected a great change in the condition of the criminals, and many profligate characters went out of the prison renewed.

In 1818, in company with her brother, J. J. Gurney, Mrs. Fry visited the prisons of northern England and Scotland, and in 1827 those of Ireland. She also visited Kaiserswerth (see Deaconess, III., 2, a; Fliedner, Theodor), and was impressed with the advantage of training for nurses. Her efforts led to the formation of societies for the help of female criminals in various parts of Great Britain; and the fame of her labors stimulated the competition of women in foreign lands. In 1839, 1840, and 1841 she visited the Continent, extending her travels as far as Hungary, where many of the criminals slept in stocks, and whipping was universally practised, even to bastinadoing. Her efforts secured remedial legislation, and the organization of prison-reform societies in Holland, Denmark, France, Prussia, and other Continental countries. In the mean while her efforts secured the organization of a society (1839) for the care of criminals after their discharge from prison, and for the visitation of the vessels that carried the convicts to the colonies. See Prison Reform.

Mrs. Fry did not confine her labors to prison reform. She successfully prosecuted a plan to supply coast vessels and seamen's hospitals with libraries. A governmental grant was supplemented by liberal private donations which enabled her and the society to distribute 52,464 volumes among 620 libraries (report for 1836). She established a "nightly shelter for the homeless" in London, and instituted a society in Brighton to discourage begging and promote industry. In 1828 her husband became bankrupt, and thenceforth she was unable to continue the liberal contributions of money she had been in the habit of making, but her zeal and personal exertions continued unabated. She was a woman of even temper, great practical skill, tenderness of heart, and deep knowledge of Scripture. Her maxim was "Charity to the soul is the soul of charity."

Mrs. Fry published: *Observations on Female Prisoners* (London, 1827); *Report by Mrs. Fry and J J Gurney on their Visit to Ireland* (1827); *Texts for Every Day in the Year* (1831; translated into French, German, and Italian); and wrote a preface for John Venn's *Sermon on the Gradual Progress of Evil* (1827).

D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: A list of books by and on Mrs. Fry is in J. Smith, *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books*, i. 811–813, privately printed, 1867. Consult: R. E. C[resswell], *Memories*, London, 1845 (Mrs. Cresswell was a daughter); *Memoirs of the Life of Mrs. Fry, by two of her Daughters*, ib. 1847. Lives have been written also by Thomas Timpson, ib. 1847; Susanna Corder, ib. 1853; I. M. Ashby, ib. 1892; E. R. Pitman, 1895. Consult also *DNB*, xx. 294–296.

FRY, JACOB: Lutheran; b. at Trappe, Pa., Feb. 9, 1834. He was graduated at Union College in 1851 and the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., in 1853. He was pastor of the Lutheran Church at Carlisle, Pa., 1854–65, and of Trinity Lutheran Church, Reading, Pa., 1865–96. Since 1891 he has been professor of homiletics and sacred oratory in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. He has written *History of Trinity Lutheran Church of Reading, Pa.* (Reading, Pa., 1894) and *Elementar Homiletics* (Philadelphia, 1897).

FUERST, fürst, **JULIUS:** German Jewish scholar and Orientalist; b. at Zerkow (35 m. s.e. of Posen) May 12, 1805; d. at Leipsic Feb. 9, 1873. He studied in Berlin, Breslau, and Halle (Ph.D., 1832), and became privat-docent in Leipsic. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of his services in this capacity he was appointed honorary professor by the Saxon government (1864). He was editor of *Der Orient*, which he founded in 1840, and of the *Sabbathblatt*, and translated Daniel and Ezra for L. Zunz's German Bible (Berlin, 1838) and wrote *Lehrgebäude der aramäischen Idiome, oder Formenlehre der chaldäischen Grammatik* (Leipsic, 1835); *Ḥaruze Peninim, Perlenschnüre aramäischer Gnomen und Lieder, oder aramäische Chrestomathie* (1836); *Oẓer Leshon ha-Ḳodesh, Concordantia Librorum Veteris Testamenti sacrorum* (in collaboration with Franz Delitzsch; 1837–40); *Pirḳe Aboth, Die Sprüche der Väter* (1839); *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Schulwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (1842); *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Juden, i.* (1844); *Cultur- und Litteraturgeschichte der Juden in Asien, i.* (1849); *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (2 vols., 1857–61; Eng. transl. by S. Davidson, London, 1865); *Geschichte des Karäertums* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1862–69); *Bibliotheca Judaica* (3 vols., 1863); *Geschichte der biblischen Litteratur und des jüdisch-hellenistischen Schrifttums* (2 vols., 1867–70); *Der Kanon des Alten Testaments nach den Ueberlieferungen in Talmud und Midrasch* (1868); and *Illustrierte Prachtbibel* (1874), together with a translation of the *Emunoth we-De'oth* of Saadia Fayyumi (1845).

Bibliography: *KL*, iv. 2081–82.

FULBERT, fül''bār', **OF CHARTRES:** An early French prelate and scholar; b. between 952 and 962; d. at Chartres Apr. 10, 1028. His birthplace is variously given as Aquitaine, the diocese of Laudun, and the town of Chartres. After studying under Gerbert (later, Pope Sylvester II.) at Reims, he opened a school at Chartres where, in addition to the ordinary studies of the Trivium and Quadrivium, he lectured on medicine and theology. In 1006 he was made bishop of Chartres, in which character he became of importance in the political and theological controversies of the time. He was notable especially for his vindication of the rights of the Church against the encroachments of the turbulent nobility. His writings include letters of the highest interest for the ecclesiastical and political history of France, sermons, poems, and devotional forms. Some of his letters touch on dogmatic questions, and declare with considerable distinctness for the doctrine of transubstantiation. His significance lies in the services he rendered to the cause of the new thought which in his time was struggling into being. He continued the tradition of Gerbert, and, without evincing any marked creative ability, was eminently successful in handing down that tradition to distinguished pupils, among whom were Hugo of Langres, Adelmann and Berengar of Tours. His school at Chartres was, after Reims, "a second fertile nursery of learning, and not for France alone." He laid greater emphasis on the positive element in Gerbert's doctrine than on his dialectic and critical system, enjoining close adherence to the authority of the Fathers of the Church.

(F. Nitzsch†.)

Bibliography: The *Epistolæ* are accessible in A. Duchesne, *Historiæ Francorum scriptores*, iv. 172–198, 5 vols., Paris, 1639–49; in Bouquet, *Recueil*, x. 443–482, and in *MPL*, cxli., which contains the rest of his works. Consult: C. Pfister, *De Fulberti . . . vita et operibus*, Nantes, 1885; *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 1744; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vii. 261–262, Paris, 1746; *Cartulaire de S. Père de Chartres*, ed. J. M. Quérard, ib. 1840; H. Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung*, i. 89–92, Berlin, 1875; K. Werner, *Gerbert von Aurillac*, pp. 273–286, Vienna, 1878; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, iii (1886), 130, 149; ii (1894), 165; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. passim (contains selections from his writings); *KL*, iv. 2092–93.

FULCHER, fül''shê', **(FOUCHER) OF CHARTRES** (*Fulcherius Carnotensis*): A monk, b. at Chartres c. 1059; d. after 1127. He took part in the first crusade and became chaplain to Baldwin I., the second king of Jerusalem; according to some accounts he was afterward bishop of Tyre and patriarch of Jerusalem. Under the title *Gesta Francorum Hierusalem peregrinantium*, he wrote a valuable history of the Crusades from 1095 to 1127 (in *MPL*, clv. 823–940, and, with title *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Hist. Occid.*, iii., Paris, 1866, 311–485, cf. preface, xxvii–xxxvi.; French transl. in Guizot, *Collection*, xxiv. 1–275, cf. preface, i.–v.; Eng. transl. in Purchas' *Pilgrims*). (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: H. von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, pp. 46–53, Leipsic, 1881; T. A. Archer and C. L. Kingsford, *The Crusades*, pp. 49–50, 55, 98–99, 135, 139–140, 142, 170, 440; J. M. Ludlow, *The Age of the Crusades*, pp. 110–115, New York, 1896.

FULCO (FOULQUES) OF NEUILLY: French ecclesiastic, preacher of the fourth crusade; b. in the second half of the twelfth century; d. at Neuilly (2 m. w. of Paris), Mar., 1202. While still a young man he was placed in charge of the parish of Neuilly. His youth had been devoted to the pursuit of pleasure, rather than to the preparation for his calling, and he was now reproached by his parishioners for his ignorance and inexperience. In 1192 he reformed, gave up worldly pleasures, and set his people an example of the most rigorous asceticism and devotion to duty. He resumed his studies and walked to Paris every week-day to learn of Peter, the famous cantor of Notre Dame. Soon he had won the respect of his parishioners and made himself known far and wide as a fearless preacher. He even warned Richard the Lion-Hearted to banish from his household the vices of arrogance, cupidity, and luxury. In 1198 he was charged

by Innocent III. with the preaching of the fourth crusade in France. He now went from place to place, accompanied by a few Cistercians and Premonstrants, preaching to enormous crowds. Many of his hearers were attracted by his reputation as a healer and performer of miracles, and his success was great. At the chapter-general of the Cistercian order in 1201 he reported that under his preaching 200,000 people had taken up the cross. In the midst of this work he retired to Neuilly for a short rest, and was there stricken with fever. At his request he was buried in the parish church at Neuilly. After having been cared for and decorated for centuries his grave was desecrated and destroyed during the French Revolution.

(F. W Dibelius.)

Bibliography: Jacobus de Vitriaco, *Hist. orientalis*, ed. F. Moschus, pp. 275 sqq., Douai, 1597; Geoffroy de Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. N. de Wailly, pp. 1 sqq., Paris, 1872; Otto of San Blas, *Chronicon*, xlvii., in *MGH*, *Script.*, xx (1868), 304 sqq. Consult: Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. lx.; J. I. Mombert, *Short Hist. of the Crusades*, p. 184, New York, 1894; T. A. Archer and C. L. Kingsford, *The Crusades*, pp. 180, 370–371, ib. 1895.

FULDA, ABBEY OF: A famous German abbey, founded in 744 by Sturm, a disciple of Boniface, in the district of Grabfeld on the banks of the River Fulda, on land given by Duke Carloman. The modern town, which grew up about the abbey, is in the territory of Hesse-Nassau, 54 m. s.e. of Cassel. Three years after the foundation the church and other buildings were complete, and a large tract of land was under cultivation. Before the constitution was drawn up, the brothers visited older monasteries, Sturm himself traveling through Italy and studying especially the life at Monte Cassino (q.v.). On his return he established his monks under the rule of St. Benedict. Boniface bore a special love to the foundation, and for its greater security obtained from Pope Zacharias a bull placing it under the immediate jurisdiction of Rome. Pepin confirmed the exemption in 753 and promised the special protection of the monarchy as well. Boniface continued his relations with Fulda, and directed that his body should be buried there; it rests in a stone sarcophagus at the present main entrance to the church. Sturm died in 779. The number of the monks and the extent of their possessions steadily increased, and their wealth was admirably employed. The abbey was one of the earliest centers of German ecclesiastical art; numerous churches were built in the surrounding country and enriched with paintings, mosaics, and beautiful vessels and manuscripts. Learning was not less encouraged. The school which was founded, probably almost as soon as the abbey, was the earliest home of theological learning in Germany. It flourished especially under the rule of Rabanus Maurus (q.v.), himself educated at Fulda and abbot from 822 to 842. The education imparted, to boys looking forward to a secular career as well as to future ecclesiastics, included the "liberal arts," grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, physics, astronomy, theology, and the German tongue. Among those who profited by it were Walafried Strabo (q.v.), afterward abbot of Reichenau, Servatus Lupus, Otfried, author of the *Krist*, and Bernard the grandson of Charlemagne, afterward king of Italy. Charlemagne laid the foundation of a library very considerable for that age, and Rabanus largely increased it. A decline began after his time; later abbots still had a care for learning, but no more great scholars or important works are found issuing thence. The most important author of these later days was Williram (q.v.). After the restoration of the abbey church by Hadamar (installed 948), artistic activity seems also to have fallen off. Meantime discipline was decaying; the reform of 1013 made no lasting improvement. The vigorous rule of Abbot Markward (1150–65) effected a change for the better; but later abbots were largely interested in protecting the property of the community from spoliation by the nobility. In 1513 the neighboring abbey of Hersfeld, where Sturm had made his first settlement, was united with Fulda. The Reformation had no little influence within the jurisdiction of the abbey, and in 1542 a reforming ordinance was wrung from Abbot Philip Schenk which contained some distinctively Protestant elements and permitted the further extension of Evangelical teaching. The Counter-reformation was begun in 1573 by Abbot Balthazar, and during the Thirty Years' War the Protestants in the territory came near getting the upper hand several times. The treaty concluded in 1631 between William V of Hesse and Gustavus Adolphus gave the territory of Fulda to the former as a vassal of Sweden, and he did his best to forward the Protestant cause there; but after the defeat at Nördlingen he was forced to resign his claims to Fulda, and Roman Catholic abbots once more took possession. The settlement of 1803 gave the territory as a secular principality to the Prince of Orange. In 1809 it was incorporated by Napoleon with the grand duchy of Frankfort, occupied by Prussia in 1815 and assigned to the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, with which it became part of Prussia in 1866.

(A. Hauck.)

Fulda has a somewhat peculiar history as an episcopal see. In a sense it was a diocese as early as 751, when quasiepiscopal jurisdiction over his territory was granted to the abbot by Pope Zacharias and confirmed by Pepin. The claim was often contested and stoutly upheld during the next thousand years, until Benedict XIV. placed it beyond doubt by formally raising the abbot to the dignity of a prince-bishop in 1752. After the Revolution, the bishopric was restored in 1827, as a suffragan see of the province of the Upper Rhine, though with slightly altered boundaries in consequence of the political changes; and other changes were made by Pius IX. in 1857 and 1871, giving the diocese a Roman Catholic population of about 150,000.

Bibliography: Sources are: C. Brower, *Antiquitatum Fuldensium libri quattuor*, Antwerp, 1612; *Codex diplomaticus Fuldensis*, ed. E. F. J. Dronke, Cassel, 1850; *Traditiones et antiquitates Fuldenses*, ed. E. F. J. Dronke, ib. 1844; Eigil, *Vita Sturmi*, ed. G. H. Pertz in *MGH*, *Script.*, ii (1829), 365–367; Bruno Candidus, *Vita Eigilis*, ib. xv (1887), 221; lists of the abbots are given, ib. xiii (1881), 272 sqq., 340 sqq., and pp. 161–218 contain the *Annales necrologici Fuldenses, 779–1065*; Theotrochus, *Epist. de ritu Fuldensi missæ celebrandæ*, in *NA*, iv. 409. Consult:

J. Gössmann, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Fürstenthums Fulda*, Fulda, 1857; K. Arnd, *Geschichte des Hochstifts Fulda*, Frankfort, 1862; J. Gegenbaur, *Das Kloster Fulda im Karolinger Zeitalter*, 2 parts, Fulda, 1871–73; A. Hartmann, *Zeitgeschichte von Fulda*, ib. 1895; E. Heydenreich, *Das älteste Fuldaer Cartular im Staatsarchive zu Marburg*, Leipsic, 1899; *Die ersten Anfänge der Bau- und Kunstthätigkeit des Klosters Fulda*, Fulda, 1900; G. Richter, *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Abtei Fulda*, Fulda, 1904; *KL*, iv. 2100–13; Rettberg, *KD*, vol. i.; Hauck, *KD*, i. 564 sqq.; and the literature under BALTHAZAR OF DERNBACH.

FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS: Deacon at Carthage; d. there before 547. He suffered banishment from Africa under the Vandal King Thrasamund and accompanied his friend and teacher, Fulgentius of Ruspe (q.v.), into exile to Sardinia, but returned to Africa in 523 and became deacon at Carthage. Nothing is known of his later life. Apart from an anonymously transmitted biography of Fulgentius of Ruspe (*MPL*, lxv. 117–150), he left behind him several letters and circulars on dogmatic and ethical questions (*MPL*, lxvii. 887–948). Best known, and of greatest interest as regards church history, is the circular addressed in 546 to the Roman deacons Pelagius and Anatolius on the occasion of the Three Chapter Controversy (q.v.). The title is, *Pro epistula Ibæ episcopi Edesseni adeoque de tribus capitulis concilii Chalcedonensis adversus acephalos*. Fulgentius expresses himself very positively against the contemplated condemnation of the Three Chapters; and he succeeded in confirming the African bishops in their opposition. There may still be mentioned, as of moment for the history of canon law, his *Breviatio canonum* (*MPL*, lxvii. 949–962), a compilation of the church regulations at that time operative in North Africa. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Letters of Fulgentius are collected in A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, iii. 2, pp. 169–184, 10 vols., Rome, 1825–38; A. Reifferscheid, *Anecdota Casinensia*, pp. 5–7, Wratislaw, 1871–72; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, p. 544, Freiburg, 1901; *DCB*, ii. 583–584.

FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE: Bishop of Ruspe in the province of Byzacena, North Africa; b. at Telepte, North Africa, 468; d. at Ruspe Jan. 1, 533. He was born of a senatorial family, and on account of his good education and practical ability obtained at an early age the office of fiscal procurator, but, under the influence of Augustine's writings, he soon entered a cloister and subjected himself to the strictest asceticism. The persecutions of catholics under the Vandal King Thrasamund drove him from his home to Sicily and Rome about 500. On his return he became abbot of a small island cloister on the African coast, and in 508 (or 507) bishop of Ruspe. Scarcely had he entered upon his office when with other catholics he was banished from North Africa. With many of his fellow exiles, including his biographer, Fulgentius Ferrandus (q.v.), he settled at Cagliari, Sardinia, where he developed great practical and literary activity and became the recognized leader of the exiles in their efforts to effect their return to Africa. In 515 Thrasamund summoned him to a disputation that he had arranged between catholics and Arians, but Fulgentius, persisting in his conviction, had to return into exile. He was likewise drawn into the disputes of the Eastern Church by request of the so-called Scythian monks (see SEMI-PELAGIANISM THEOPASCHITES). On the death of Thrasamund in 523 he returned to Ruspe and resumed the administration of his diocese, which he resigned a year before his death.

Fulgentius was one of the most influential champions of orthodoxy against Arianism and Semi-Pelagianism, to which he opposed the Augustinian doctrine, though avoiding, as far as possible, its subtleties and austerities. Of his numerous writings the most important are: *Contra Arianos; Ad Thrasamundum regem Vandalorum libri iii*; *De remissione peccatorum ad Euthymium libri ii*; *Ad Monimum libri iii*; *De veritate prædestinationis et gratiæ dei ad Johannem et Venerium libri iii*; *De fide sive de regula veræ fidei ad Petrum*, his best-known and most valuable writing; and *Liber de incarnatione et gratia domini nostri Jesu Christi*, addressed to the Scythian monks, and also designated as *Epist. (xvii.) ad Petrum diaconum*. The best edition of the works of Fulgentius is that of L. Mangeant (Paris, 1684; reprinted in *MPL*, lxv. 105–1018). G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, pp. 544 sqq., Freiburg, 1901; F. Wörter, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus*, Münster, 1900; Harnack, *Dogma*, v. 255 sqq., 293; *DCB*, ii. 576–583 (rather detailed); *ASB*, Jan., i. 32–45.

FULKE, WILLIAM: English Puritan; b. in London 1538; d. Aug. 28, 1589. He was educated at St. Paul's School, London, and at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1558; M.A., 1563; B.D., 1568; D.D., 1572). After studying law for six years at Clifford's Inn he returned to Cambridge to study theology. He was appointed fellow in 1564, principal lecturer of his college in 1565, and preacher and Hebrew lecturer in 1567. On his return to Cambridge he allied himself with Thomas Cartwright (q.v.), became a zealous champion of Puritanism and an opponent of Roman Catholicism. He took a prominent part in the vestiarian controversy, inducing about 300 students, at one time, to discard the surplice in the chapel of St. John's. This led to his expulsion, but he was soon restored to his fellowship. On being narrowly defeated for the headship of his college in 1569 he retired from the university and shortly afterward secured the livings of Warley in Essex, and Dennington in Suffolk. In 1572 he accompanied Lord Lincoln to France and was one of the friends who persuaded Cartwright to return to England. In 1578 he obtained the mastership of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, which he held till his death. He was also vice-chancellor of the university in 1581. The same year he was deputed to hold a public disputation with Edmund Campion (q.v.) in the Tower of London, and in 1582 he was one of twenty-five theologians appointed to hold disputations with Roman Catholic priests and Jesuits. He was one of the ablest controversialists of his time. Of his numerous polemic writings, directed largely against the leaders of the Counterreformation in England, the most important are: *T Stapleton and Martiall (Two Popish Heretics) Confuted* (London, 1580; ed. R. Gibbings for the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848); *A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue*,

against Gregory Martin (1583; ed. C. N. Hartshorne, for the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843); and *The Text of the New Testament Translated out of the Vulgar Latin by the Papists at Rheims* (1589).

Bibliography: John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, 4 vols., London, 1709–31; T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain*, v. 79, ib. 1845; C. H. and T. Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, ii. 57–61, ib. 1861; *DNB*, xx. 305–308.

FULLER, ANDREW: English Baptist preacher and author; b. at Wicken (12 m. n.e. of Cambridge), Cambridgeshire, Feb. 6, 1754; d. at Kettering (13 m. n.n.e. of Northampton), Northamptonshire, May 2, 1815. He was of humble rural parentage. About Nov., 1769, he experienced conversion and in Apr., 1770, he was baptized into the fellowship of a hyper-Calvinistic Baptist church, of antinomian tendencies, at Soham. The pastor of the church was shortly afterward compelled to resign for teaching that men have the power to follow or resist God's will, the majority denying absolutely any freedom on man's part and regarding as impertinent and heretical any human effort for the salvation of sinners. Fuller, who had received only a moderate education, became greatly interested in the theological questions that were being discussed, and from 1771 onward read whatever pertinent literature was accessible. He early became familiar with the hyper-Calvinistic works of John Gill and John Brine (Baptists) and was profoundly influenced by the writings of John Owen, the Puritan, and of Jonathan Edwards, the American divine. In 1772 he was invited to preach in the Soham church and in 1774 became its pastor, sound Evangelical sentiments having by this time gained ground in the community. The influence of the Evangelical revival in England and America (led by the Wesleys, Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, and others) soon gained the mastery over Fuller, and he became the protagonist of the Evangelical and missionary movement among British Baptists. Such was his industry and strength of mind that, without academic training, he became a master in theological thinking and writing and acquired a working knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages. His tract entitled *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (Northampton, 1784) was widely circulated among dissenters and Evangelical churchmen and produced a profound impression. His moderate, sane, Evangelical Calvinism was embodied in effective form in *The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems Examined and Compared as to Their Moral Tendency*, London, 1794. His writings on Sandemanianism were occasioned by his coming in contact with this type of religious thought during his Scottish tours on behalf of foreign missions. He was one of the founders of the Baptist Foreign Missionary Society formed for the support of Carey and his coadjutors in India, and by far the most influential home promoter of its objects. His activity in visiting the churches throughout Great Britain in this cause diffused widely his interest in missions and his sane Evangelical and Baptist views. His influence on American Baptists has been incalculable.

Albert H. Newman.

Bibliography: The *Works* have appeared in many editions —London, 1838, 1840, 1853; ed. by his son, A. G. Fuller, with a memoir, for *Bohn's Standard Library*, 1852; ed. J. Belcher, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1833. For his life consult: J. Ryland, *Life and Death of Rev. Andrew Fuller*, London, 1816; J. W Morris, *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Rev. Andrew Fuller*, ib. 1816; T. E. Fuller, *Memoir of Andrew Fuller*, ib. 1863; *DNB*, xx. 309–310.

FULLER, RICHARD: American Baptist preacher; b. at Beaufort, S. C., Apr. 22, 1804; d. in Baltimore Oct. 20, 1876. He was the son of a prosperous South Caroilna cotton-planter, and was brought up as an Episcopalian. In 1820 he entered Harvard, where he took high rank as scholar and debater. Though he was obliged on account of ill health to abandon his studies before the completion of his course, he received his degree in 1824. Returning to South Carolina he studied law, was admitted to the bar, and by 1831 had gained a high reputation in his chosen profession. In Oct., 1831, he was converted under the ministry of Daniel Baker, a Baptist evangelist, and soon after began to preach with remarkable eloquence. As pastor in Beaufort, his home town, he was eminently successful and soon gained a national reputation as preacher and denominational leader. He was one of the most eminent of the Southern representatives in the Triennial Convention at the time of the rupture of the Northern and Southern Baptists on the slavery question, and with Francis Wayland as his chief opponent ably defended, in a literary way, the Southern view of slavery. As pastor of the Eutaw Place Church, Baltimore (1846–76), he came to be recognized as the foremost pulpit orator of the American Baptists, and as a denominational leader he was prominent in the great denominational gatherings. In figure and feature he was impressive and attractive.

His *Sermons*, in three volumes, were published posthumously (Baltimore, 1877).

Albert H. Newman.

Bibliography: J. H. Cuthbert, *Life of Richard Fuller*, New York, 1878.

FULLER, THOMAS: English theologian and church historian; b. at Aldwincle (3 m. n.e. of Thrapston), Northamptonshire, June, 1608; d. in London Aug. 16, 1661. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1625; M.A., 1628), afterward entering Sidney Sussex College as a fellow commoner. In 1630 he was ordained and appointed to the living of St. Benet's, Cambridge. The next year he published his first book, in the fantastic poetical style of the period, *David's Hainous Sinne, Heartie Repentance, Heavie Punishment*, and obtained the prebend of Netherbury in Salisbury Cathedral. From 1634 to 1641 he held the rectory of Broadwindsor in Dorsetshire, but did not wholly break off his connection with Cambridge. His first important book, the *History of the Holy Warre*, i.e., the Crusades, appeared in 1639. A year later he was elected proctor in convocation, and presently removed to London, where his wit in the pulpit was widely celebrated; ultimately he became lecturer at the Savoy Chapel. In 1642 he published his most characteristic work, *The Holy State and the Profane State*. His loyalty caused him to be driven out of London and to take

refuge at Oxford. He was chaplain for a time to Princess Henrietta, and then placed himself under the protection of Lord Montagu of Boughton, living quietly and supporting himself by his pen. During these years he brought out his picturesque geography of Palestine, called *A Pisgah-Sight* (1650), and his most celebrated work, the huge *Church History of Britain* (1656), which, like all his books, abounds in quaint humor and epigrammatic sayings. Its accuracy was impugned by Heylyn, and Fuller retorted in a lively *Appeal of Injured Innocence* (1659), his last publication of importance. At the Restoration he recovered his ecclesiastical offices, and was looking forward to a bishopric when he was attacked by typhoid fever and died. His famous *History of the Worthies of England* appeared posthumously (1662). Fuller was never held preeminent as a divine, and as a historian he was too rapid and careless to inspire confidence, but he holds an important place among the prose-writers of the seventeenth century, and his quaint humor has given him an undying popularity. Besides the works already named, his *Good Thoughts in Bad Times* (1645) and *Thoughts in Worse Times* (1647), and *Mixt Contemplations in Better Times* (1660) may be mentioned. He also contributed lives to *Abel Redivivus*, a collection of biographies of " moderne divines " (London, 1651).

Bibliography: A very full list of Fuller's works is given at the end of the sketch in *DNB*, xx. 315–320. *The Church History, History of University of Cambridge*, and *History of Waltham Abbey* were edited by James Nichols, London, 1868, and for the Oxford University Press by J. S. Brewer, 1845. The *Worthies of England* was reprinted London, 1840. The original authority on the life is the anonymous biography printed in Brewer's ed. of the *Church History*. The best life is by J. E. Bailey, *Life of Thomas Fuller, with Notices of his Books, his Kinsmen and his Friends*, London, 1874. Consult also M. Fuller, *Thomas Fuller, his Life, Times and Writings*, 2 vols., ib. 1886.

FULLONIUS, GULIELMUS (*Gulielmus Gnapheus, Willem van de Voldersgraft, Willem de Volder*): Protestant theologian; b. at The Hague, Holland, 1493; d. at Norden (75 m. n.w. of Bremen), Hanover, 1568. He received a humanistic education and became at an early age teacher in his native city, but had to flee after various persecutions on account of his faith. From 1535 to 1541 he was rector of the gymnasium in Elbing, then went to Königsberg as counselor of Duke Albert and was active there from 1544 to 1547 as rector of the academy. Expelled also from there he went to East Frisia, where he died. On his theological conflicts see Briessmann, Johann; Staphylus, Fridericus.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: *Studien en Bijdragen op't gebied der historische Theologie verzameld door . J G. de Hoop-Scheffer*, Amsterdam, 1868; P. Tschackert, *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen*, i. 254 sqq., Leipsic, 1890; *ADB*, ix. 279–280.

FULTON, JOHN: Protestant Episcopalian; b. in Glasgow, Scotland, Apr. 2, 1834; d. in Philadelphia Apr. 24, 1907. He studied in Aberdeen, and at the age of sixteen left Scotland for the United States. In 1857 he was ordained priest in New Orleans and after serving as rector and journalist was appointed in 1892 professor of canon law in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia. He wrote *Letters on Christian Unity* (New York, 1868); *Index Canonum* (1872); *Laws of Marriage* (1883); *The Beautiful Land: Palestine, Historical, Geographical, and Pictorial* (1891); *The Chalcedonian Decree: or, Historical Christianity Misrepresented by Modern Theology, Confirmed by Modern Science, and Untouched by Modern Criticism* (Slocum lectures; 1892); and *Memoirs of Frederic A. P Barnard* (1896). He also edited *Ten Epochs of Church History* (New York, 1897–99).

FUNCK, JOHANN: Lutheran divine; b. at Wöhrd (a suburb of Nuremberg), Germany, Feb. 7, 1518; beheaded at Königsberg Oct. 28, 1566. After obtaining the master's degree at Wittenberg, and after preaching in several places, he was recommended to Duke Albert of Prussia by Veit Dietrich, and accordingly went to Königsberg in 1547, where the duke was so pleased with the young clergyman that he made him his court preacher (1549). On the outbreak of the Osiandrian controversy, Funck sided with Osiander and his son-in-law Andreas Aurifaber (q.v.), physician in ordinary to the duke; when Osiander died (Oct. 17, 1552), Funck delivered the eulogy. Joachim Mörlin (q.v.), his principal opponent, was obliged to leave Prussia in 1553, and Funck was then considered the dominant theological representative of Osiander's teaching. Duke John Albert of Mecklenburg, the Lutheran son-in-law of Duke Albert of Prussia, long tried to influence his father-in-law against his protégé, and Funck was obliged to retract certain " heresies " at a synod held at Riesenburg in 1556 and to promise to abide by the Augsburg Confession and the *Loci* of Melanchthon. The duke still showed him great favor, however, but after his marriage to Osiander's daughter, the widow of Aurifaber, who died Dec. 12, 1559, the wrath of Osiander's opponents now turned upon Funck, who was both the confessor and counselor of the duke and treasurer of the duchess. The dissension was increased by alien adventurers like Paul Skalich, who took advantage of the senile duke, while councilors belonging to the highest nobility were pushed aside. The estates, feeling that their rights were infringed, appealed to the suzerain of the country, King Sigismund II. of Poland, who sent a commission in Aug., 1566, to Königsberg to investigate the matter. Funck, together with the councilors Horst, Schell, and Steinbach, was charged with opposition to the ecclesiastical and political governance of the state, and the Polish commission directed that the case be tried by the court in the Kneiphof, Königsberg, thus putting the accused at the mercy of their enemies. While it was true that Funck's position rendered him partly liable for the measures of the duke, Albert gave the final decision and was, therefore, personally responsible. Little value can be attached to the confession extorted from the prisoner by threats of torture, and there is, therefore, no tangible evidence of guilt. Nevertheless, Funck, Horst, and Schnell were condemned and executed in the Kneiphof market-place at Königsberg; Steinbach had to leave the country; and Paul Skalich, the real cause of the mischief, had the good fortune to escape.

The works of Funck are as follows: *Chronologia ab urbe condita* (2 vols., Königsberg, 1545–52); expositions of Psalms xlvi. (1548), ciii. (1549), and ix. (1551); *Auszug und kurzer Bericht von der Gerechtigkeit der Christen für Gott* (1552); *Wahrhaftiger und gründlicher Bericht wie und was Gestalt die ärgerliche Spaltung von der Gerechtigkeit des Glaubens sich anfänglich im Lande Preussen erhoben* (1553); *Der Patriarchen Lehre und Glauben* (1554); *Vier Predigten von der Rechtfertigung des Sünders durch den Glauben für Gott. Item: Kurtze Bekenntnis* (1563).

PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. A. Hase, *Herzog Albrecht von Preussen und sein Hofprediger*, Leipsic, 1789 (really a biography of Funck); P. Tschackert, *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen*, i.–iii., Leipsic, 1890 (contains essays on Funck's life up to 1551); idem, *Ungedruckte Briefe zur allgemeinen Reformationsgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1894.

FUNCKE, OTTO: German Protestant; b. at Wülfrath (6 m. w.n.w. of Elberfeld) Mar. 9, 1836. He studied in Halle, Tübingen, and Bonn, and held pastorates in his native town (1860–61), Elberfeld (1861–63), and Holche (1863–68). Since 1868 he has been pastor of the Friedenskirche, Bremen. Among his numerous writings, mention may be made of his *Reisebilder und Heimatklänge* (3 series, Bremen, 1869–72); *Die Schule des Lebens, oder christliche Lebensbilder im Lichte des Buches Jonas* (1871; Eng. transl., *School of Life*, London, 1885); *Christliche Fragezeichen* (1873; Eng. transl., under the title *Self Will and God's Will: or, How to Discern What is God's Will in the Perplexing Questions of Life*, by E. Stirling, London, 1887); *Verwandlungen, oder wie ein Sehender blind und ein Blinder sehend wird* (1873); *Tägliche Andachten* (1875); *St. Paulus zu Wasser und zu Lande* (1877); *Freud, Leid, Arbeit im Ewigkeitslicht* (1879); *Seelenkämpfe und Seelenfriede* (sermons; 1881); *Willst du gesund werden? Beiträge zur christlichen Seelenpflege* (1882); *Englische Bilder in deutscher Beleuchtung* (1883); *Die Welt des Glaubens und die Alltagswelt, dargestellt nach den Fusstapfen Abrahams* (1885; Eng. transl. by S. Taylor, *The World of Faith and the Everyday World*, Edinburgh, 1891); *Wie der Hirsch schreiet* (sermons; 1887); *Brot und Schwert, ein Buch für hungernde, zweifelnde und kämpfende Herzen* (1889); *Der Wandel vor Gott, dargelegt nach den Fusstapfen des Patriarchen Joseph* (1890); *Neue Reisebilder und Heimatklänge* (1892); *Jesus und die Menschen, oder angewandtes Christentum* (1894); *Wie man glücklich wird und glücklich macht* (1896; Eng. transl. by S. Taylor, *How to Be Happy and Make Others Happy*, London, 1896); *Du und deine Seele* (1896); *Die Fussspuren des lebendigen Gottes in meinem Lebenswege* (2 vols., Altenburg, 1898–1900); *Ungeschminkte Wahrheiten über christliches Leben* (1902); and *Reisegedanken und Gedankenreisen eines Emeritus* (1905).

FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Fundamental and non-Fundamental Doctrines (§ 1).
The Fundamental Doctrines Defined Negatively (§ 2).
The Fundamental Doctrines Defined Positively (§ 3).
Late Schools and Theories (§ 4).

The distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of Christianity is useful, since, by emphasizing the great cardinal articles of the Christian faith, it promotes the union of the various parts of the Christian Church and develops a spirit of tolerance with regard to the articles of lesser importance in which they disagree. The Roman Catholic Church rejects the distinction (cf. *KL*, article "Dogma," iii. 1879–86) on the ground that it resolves doctrines into essential or necessary, and unessential or incidental. Nevertheless the Church recognizes a distinction in the relative importance of its doctrines. Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent distinguish concerning the relative value of the sacraments, baptism and the Eucharist (the "crown of the sacraments") being the "major sacraments." Although the distinction is not universally made by Protestant theologians, it early came into use. N. Hunnius was the first to use it in the Lutheran Church in his *De fundamentali dissensu doctrinæ Lutheranæ et Calvinianæ* (Wittenberg, 1626). He was followed by Quenstädt and others, and more recently by F. A. Philippi (*Glaubenslehre*, i. 73 sqq., Gütersloh, 1854), who, starting from the atonement as the constitutive principle, defines as fundamental all articles which necessarily follow from it.

1. Fundamental and non-Fundamental Doctrines.

The distinction was urged by the younger Turretin (d. 1737), and in England by Chillingworth (d. 1644), Stillingfleet (d. 1699), Waterland (d. 1740), and others in the interest of ecclesiastical toleration; before this, Francis Bacon, in his *Advancement of Learning*, had insisted upon distinguishing between "points fundamental" and "points of further perfection." The Parliament of 1653 voted indulgence to all who professed the "Fundamentals," and appointed a commission, consisting of Archbishop Ussher (who resigned, his place being filled by Baxter), Owen, Goodwin, and others, to define what the "Fundamentals" were. Baxter was for holding to the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. But the commission drew up sixteen articles which were presented to Parliament, and only missed ratification by its dissolution in 1653 (cf. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, ii., 143–144, New York, 1863). The varying importance of the doctrines of the Christian system and the growing tolerance of later times have produced the conviction that it is desirable to emphasize the more important articles. The Evangelical Alliance, on the assumption that agreement in fundamentals is a sufficient foundation for Catholic communion, has adopted a constitution of nine articles, which are regarded as essentials of Christian union (see EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE).

The distinction of fundamentals and non-fundamentals is based upon the valid assumption that some articles are of greater importance than others. It is justified by the example of Paul in his teaching against the Judaizing tendencies of his time. The following distinctions may be helpful in defining the term: Fundamental when applied to articles does not imply that they are the only articles which it is expedient or desirable for a Church to teach, and the individual to believe.

2. The Fundamental Doctrines Defined Negatively.

The apostasy of the angels, the eternal duration of future punishment, the single or double procession of the Holy Spirit (the *filioque* clause being rejected by the Greek Church; see FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY), may all be Scriptural doctrines, and ought to be believed, but are not fundamental doctrines of Christianity (although some would so consider the endlessness of future punishment).

The fundamental doctrines of Christianity are not to be confused with the distinctive tenets of a denomination. Denominational differences may and often do embody the truth; but the mode of baptism, for example, or the particular theory of the decrees (however valuable a right view on this subject may be as a constructive principle in dogmatic theology), or a special form of ecclesiastical polity, can not be regarded as fundamental. Christianity might not do so well with one class of opinions on these subjects (say, baptism by sprinkling, supralapsarianism, and the congregational principle of church government) as it would with another; but it would still remain radically unchanged, and continue to exert its beneficent influence.

The fundamental doctrines of Christianity are not synonymous with the doctrines essential to salvation. The latter depend upon the answer of the individual to two questions—"What think ye of Christ?" and "What must I do to be saved?" A living faith in Christ as the one sent of God for the salvation of the world is essential to salvation, and sufficient for it (John vi. 47; Acts xvi. 31). The fundamental doctrines of Christianity are broader in their scope. They concern it as an objective system of truth.

The term fundamental is not properly applied to doctrines which distinguish Christianity from natural religion. There is a distinction between the fundamentals of religion and the fundamentals of Christianity Religion is possible on the basis of the Five Articles of Lord Herbert of Cherbury; but the superstructure of the Christian religion has a different foundation. Some of the tenets which Christianity has in common with natural religion, as the existence of God, are fundamental to the former.

The Apostles' Creed, though a venerable and excellent summary of the Christian's faith, is not a perfect statement of the fundamental articles of Christianity. On the one hand, it brings out only by implication the doctrine of atonement, passes over entirely the Scriptures, and, on the other, as Waterland puts it, is "*peccant* in excess."

The fundamental doctrines of Christianity, then, are those which lie at the basis of the Christian system, and without which its professed aim (the glory of God and the highest welfare of man) could not, by logical necessity and with subjective certainty, be evolved. Waterland's definition is as follows: "Fundamental, as applied to Christianity, means something so necessary to its being, or at least its well-being, that it could not subsist, or maintain itself tolerably, without it" (vol. v., p. 74). And again: "Whatever verities are found to be plainly and directly essential to the doctrine of the Gospel *covenant* are fundamental" (p. 103). According to Sherlock (p. 256), they are doctrines "which are of the essence of Christianity, and without which the whole building and superstructure must fall."

3. The Fundamental Doctrines Defined Positively.

The most fundamental doctrine of Christianity is salvation by Christ; and the principle will hold good that whatever doctrine stands in most necessary connection therewith is the most fundamental. The statement in Rom. i. 1–6 (the divine existence, Scriptures, incarnation, grace, faith, and resurrection) approaches nearest of any passage in Scripture to a comprehensive enumeration of the fundamental doctrines. Waterland enumerated seven, as follows: (1) The Creator, or Covenanter; (2) covenant; (3) charter of the covenant, or Sacred Writ; (4) mediator; (5) repentance and a holy life; (6) sacraments; (7) two future states. The central principle from which he started was the Christian covenant. The sacraments, however, can hardly be regarded as a fundamental. The following statement is preferable: (1) The Fatherhood of God; (2) the Trinity; (3) the incarnation; (4) atonement; (5) faith or union with Christ, the condition of man's best being; (6) the immortality of the soul; (7) the Scriptures the summary of the divine purposes concerning man.

In defining what is fundamental in Christianity, it is as desirable to avoid a narrow as to avoid a latitudinarian tendency. Certain communions insist upon regarding episcopacy and the authority of the Church as fundamental. Individuals might insist upon particular views of original sin, the divine decrees, the inspiration of the Scriptures, or the duration and nature of future punishment. But few of these are touched upon in the Apostles' Creed, and none definitely answered. Divergence of view on these points is of inconsiderable importance in comparison with the cardinal doctrines of God's existence, the Messiah's work, saving faith, the soul's immortality, and the sufficiency of Scripture for human illumination and guidance, and can not limit the perpetuity of Christianity. It is, however, not to be forgotten that a Church may profess these fundamental doctrines, and yet so combine fundamental errors as to modify, if not completely to destroy, their force. Of such errors, as held in the Roman Catholic Church, Sherlock says (p. 314) that "all the wit of man can not reconcile them with the Christian faith." On the other hand, a religious communion (as the strict Unitarians or Universalists) may deny fundamental truths, and yet sincerely accept Christianity as the only and perfect religion, and Christ as the Lord and Savior.

4. Late Schools and Theories.

The views of the school of advanced New Testament criticism represented in varying degrees of positiveness by different scholars from Harnack to Paul Wernle of Basel (*Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, Tübingen, 1904) attempt to retain the Christian religion as the final religion and Christ as "the great Deliverer" from the bondage of legalism in religious ritual and doctrine, and at the same time cast aside some of the evident teachings of the books of the New Testament, such as the bodily resurrection of our Lord and those doctrines which it is claimed

Paul invented by a process of reflection, such as the vicarious atonement through Christ's death. It would seem as if there could be no terms of agreement between this school and the received views of the Church. For what is fundamental in the views of the Church is in part completely set aside if the distinctive theology of the Pauline epistles is without warrant in fact and only a product of the Apostle's own brain.

Prof. Alfred Seeberg of Dorpat, in his *Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipsic, 1903), has attempted to arrange the articles of a supposed primitive catechism of fundamental tenets, which, he thinks, it was the custom to carry or send to new churches for their adoption. He bases the existence of such a formula upon Rom. vi. 17 ("that form of doctrine which was delivered you"), II Thess. ii. 15, and other passages, and reconstructs it on the basis of I Cor. xv. 3–5 and other Pauline statements. He includes in it a belief in the divine mission of the Son of God, his crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and second coming. This formula became the nucleus of the Apostles' Creed and was the kernel of apostolic preaching. The treatment is suggestive and points to the fact that in the pages of the New Testament as they have been preserved there is a distinctive set of tenets which were new when they were proclaimed and composed the early Christian teaching.

An indirect attempt to define what is fundamental in the Christian system was made in the so-called Chicago-Lambeth Articles, adopted first by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Chicago, 1886, and then by the Lambeth Conference in 1888 (see Lambeth Conference). They were intended as an invitation to church union and a basis for it, but were officially rejected by the Presbyterian General Assembly in the United States and were unfavorably received by other bodies. The fundamentals of the Articles (called the "Quadrilateral" because four in number) were: "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; the Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; the two sacraments ordained by Christ himself—baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him; the historic episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church."

D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: W. Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, i. 4–5, Oxford, 1638; W. Sherlock, *A Discourse about Christian Unity, Being a Defence of Bp. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*, chap. v., pp. 248–316, London, 1681; J. A. Turretin, *A Discourse concerning the Fundamental Articles in Religion*, ib. 1720; D. Waterland, *A Discourse of Fundamentals*, ib. 1735 (v. 73–104 of ed. of Oxford, 1843); Tholuck, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Theologie*, 1851. Modern treatments of the subject do not appear under the title of Fundamentals; the topic is discussed more or less directly in writings upon Christian Unity and Church Union, e.g., A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, New York, 1893; J. Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, London, 1898; A. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Berlin, 1900, Eng. transl., *What is Christianity*, New York, 1901, which was ably answered by H. Cremer, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Gütersloh, 1901, Eng. transl., *Reply to Harnack on "The Essence of Christianity,"* New York, 1904. Consult also R. D. Browne, *The Fundamental Truths of the Catholic Church*, London, 1890.

FUNK, FRANZ XAVER: German Roman Catholic; b. at Abtsgmünd, Württemberg, Oct. 12, 1840; d. at Tübingen Feb. 24, 1907 He studied in Tübingen (Ph.D., 1863) and at Rottenburg, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1864. He then studied for a year in Paris, and was lecturer in the Wilhelmstift at Tübingen 1866–70. In 1870 he was appointed professor of church history, patrology, and archeology at Tübingen. He wrote *Zins und Wucher* (Tübingen, 1868); *Geschichte des kirchlichen Zinsverbotes* (1876); *Die Echtheit der ignatianischen Briefe* (1882); *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Rottenburg, 1886); *Doctrina duodecim apostolorum* (Tübingen, 1887); *Die katholische Landesuniversität Ellwangen* (1889); *Die apostolischen Konstitutionen* (Rottenburg, 1891); *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen* (3 vols., Paderborn, 1897–1907); *Das Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften* (Mainz, 1901); and *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum* (2 vols., 1905).

FUNK, ISAAC KAUFMANN: Lutheran; b at Clifton, O., Sept. 10, 1839. He was graduated at Wittenberg College in 1860 and was ordained to the Lutheran ministry in 1861. He was pastor at Carey, O., 1862–64 and of St. Matthew's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Brooklyn, 1865–72. He then resigned from the ministry, and after a tour of Europe, Egypt, and Palestine was associate editor of *The Christian Radical* (Pittsburg, Pa.) 1872–73 and of *The Union Advocate* (New York) 1873–75. In 1876 he founded *The Metropolitan Pulpit* and in the following year *The Complete Preacher*, merging the two in 1878 into *The Homiletic Monthly*, which has been called *The Homiletic Review* since 1885. He established *The Voice*, a total-abstinence paper, in 1880, *The Missionary Review* in 1888, and *The Literary Digest* in 1889. In 1878 he entered into partnership with Adam Willis Wagnalls, founding the publishing firm which was incorporated in 1890 as the Funk & Wagnalls Company. He has thus been instrumental in publishing a large number of theological works, among which mention may be made of *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, and *The Standard Bible Dictionary*. He is editor-in-chief of *A Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, and has edited G. Croly's *Salathiel* under the title *Tarry Thou Till I Come* (New York, 1901), and has written *The Next Step in Evolution* (New York, 1902); *The Widow's Mite and Other Psychic Phenomena* (1904); and *The Psychic Riddle* (1907).

FUNSTEN, JAMES BOWEN: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Idaho; b. at The Highlands, Clarke Co., Va., July 23, 1856. He studied at the Virginia Military Institute, Lexington (C.E., 1875), and the University of Virginia (LL.B., 1878), and after practising law for a short time, entered the Theological Seminary at Alexan-

dria, from which he was graduated in 1882. He was ordered deacon in the same year, and was advanced to the priesthood in 1883. From 1882 to 1884 he was a missionary at Bristol, Tenn., and at Marion, Va., and after traveling in Europe in 1884, was a missionary attached to the staff of Christ Church, Richmond, Va., 1884–90 and a general missionary in Virginia 1890–92. From 1892 to 1899 he was rector of Trinity Church, Portsmouth, Va., and in 1899 was consecrated missionary bishop of Boisé, his diocese comprising portions of the States of Idaho and Wyoming. In theology he is Evangelical, and, besides having been editor of *The Southern Churchman* 1885–86, has written *Christ or the World* (New York, 1890) and *A Study of Confirmation* (1895).

FURNESS, WILLIAM HENRY: Unitarian; b. in Boston, Mass., Apr. 20, 1802; d. in Philadelphia Jan. 30, 1896. He studied at Harvard (B.A., 1820), and after completing his theological training at Cambridge was ordained pastor of the First Unitarian Congregational Church, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1825, and held the office until his retirement in 1875. He was a leading abolitionist, and was author of *Remarks on the Four Gospels* (Philadelphia, 1835); *Jesus and his Biographers* (1838); *A History of Jesus* (1850); *Thoughts on the Life and Character of Jesus of Nazareth* (Boston, 1859); *The Unconscious Truth of the Four Gospels* (Philadelphia, 1868); *Jesus* (1871); *The Power of Spirit Manifest in Jesus of Nazareth* (1877); *The Story of the Resurrection Told Once More* (1885); *Verses: Translations from the German and Hymns* (Boston, 1886); and *Pastoral Offices* (1894). He also translated D. Schenkel's *Das Charakterbild Jesu* (Wiesbaden, 1864) under the title *Character of Jesus Portrayed* (2 vols., Boston, 1866).

FURRER, HANS KONRAD: Swiss Protestant; b. at Fluntern, near Zurich, Nov. 5, 1838; d. at Zurich Apr. 14, 1908. He studied in Zurich (1857–62) and was ordained to the ministry in 1862. In 1863 he made a tour of Palestine, and in 1869 became privatdocent for Biblical archeology in the University of Zurich. He held various pastorates in the canton from his ordination until 1876, when he became pastor of St. Peter's, Zurich. He began to lecture continuously at the university in 1885, and in 1888 was appointed professor of the general history of religion. In theology he was a liberal conservative. He wrote *Wanderungen durch das heilige Land* (Zurich, 1865); *Vorträge über religiöse Tagesfragen* (1895); *Katholizismus und Protestantismus* (1899); and *Vorträge über das Leben Jesu Christi* (1902).

FURSA (FURSEY, Lat. *Furseus*), SAINT: Irish monk and missionary; b. of noble family probably in Connaught; d. at Maceriæ (Mazeroeles, on the Authie), in Ponthieu (northern France), Jan. 16, probably 650. He was brought up in Munster under monastic discipline and lived the usual life of an Irish monk, founding a monastery at Rathmat, probably in the northwest of County Clare. For ten years he went up and down in Ireland preaching repentance and judgment. Then with his two brothers and two monks he traveled eastward, and in 637 (?) was received by King Sigbert of East Anglia and assisted him and Bishop Felix (see FELIX, SAINT) in establishing Christianity among the only half-converted people. He built a monastery at Cnoberesburg (Burghcastle, 5 m. from Yarmouth), then, with a single companion, retired to a hermitage. After a year the menace from Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, drove him away, and he went to France. He found refuge at the court of the young Clovis II., king of Neustria. Erchinoald, mayor of the palace, gave him land at Latiniacum (Lagny-sur-Marne, 18 m. e. of Paris), where he built a monastery in 644. He was buried at Péronne (75 m. n.n.e. of Paris) and was long honored there. Miracles were attributed to him even in his lifetime.

Fursa was noteworthy chiefly for his visions, which were probably due to cataleptic attacks. He saw and conversed with angels, was attacked by demons, and beheld the awful torments of the wicked; impending calamities were foretold to him. He would relate what he had seen, says Bede, only to those who wished to hear "from holy zeal and desire of information." Similar visions were not uncommon experiences of the monks. The narratives of them were highly popular and constitute a distinct class of medieval literature (cf. Plummer's *Bede*, ii. 294–295, Oxford, 1896, and, for Fursa's visions, Olden's *Church of Ireland*, pp. 87–90, London, 1895).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Three lives of Fursa in *ASB*, Jan., ii. 36–55, of which the first and best, by an anonymous writer, is also in J. Colgan, *Acta Sanctorum*, i. 75–98, Louvain, 1645, *ASM*, ii. 300–315, and De Smedt and De Backer, *Acta sanctorum Hiberniæ*, pp. 77 sqq., Edinburgh, 1888. Consult: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 19; J. Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. 448–464, 4 vols., Dublin, 1829; J. O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, i. 222–286; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, iii. 613–615; J. Corblet, *Hagiographie du diocèse d'Amiens*, vol. ii., Paris, 1870; G. Grützmacher, in *ZKG*, xix. 2 (1898), pp. 190–196.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

New Testament Doctrine (§ 1).
Historical Christian Belief (§ 2).
Tendencies of Recent Discussions (§ 3).
Two Leading Views (§ 4).
Endlessness (§ 5).

This presentation is limited to punishment after death; all reference to earthly punishment is not excluded, but this is considered only so far as its nature and aim have a bearing on the future state.

1. New Testament Doctrine. In the New Testament punishment is part of the eschatological program which follows upon the judgment (q.v.). The wicked are sent into Gehenna (q.v.), or into a condition designated variously as unquenchable fire, the undying worm, outer darkness, weeping and gnashing of teeth, eternal destruction, and the second death (Mark ix. 43, 48; Matt. xxv. 30; II Thess. i. 9; Rev. xx. 14; cf. II Pet. iii. 7, and Jesus' parables of judgment—the tares, the drag-net, the wedding guest, the virgins, and the talents). Punishment is described as positive (as above), as natural (Gal. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25), and according to degree of guilt. The finality of punishment is supported by contemporary Jewish belief, by the term Gehenna and destruction (Gk. *olethros*, *apōleia*), by the parables of Jesus in which finality is implied (Matt. xiii. 39–43, 47–50), by the

period at which judgment is consummated, and by the contrast of the state of the wicked with that of the blessed (Matt. xxv. 46). Yet, since the New Testament teaching is practical rather than theoretical, other intimations have been found there, concerning its nature, aim, duration, and outcome (see ANNIHILATIONISM, and UNIVERSALISM).

2. Historical Christian Belief.

Historical Christian belief concerning the nature of future punishment has been determined in part by the doctrine of the resurrection of the same bodies that died (see RESURRECTION), of hell as a place and its fire as real (E. D. Griffin, *Sermons not before Published, etc.*, "Hell Composed of Material Fire," pp. 46–53, New York, 1844). In particular, Christian mystics have been fond of dwelling on the physical condition of the lost, with every refinement of imaginative ingenuity, inventing tortures which reflected the most terrible and revolting forms of human suffering (Dante, *Inferno;* H. Suso, *Der ewigen Weyssheit Büchlein*, chap. ix., Dillingen, 1567; Jonathan Edwards, *Works*, vii., pp. 387–388, New York, 1829). Punishment has also been conceived of as separation from God, as remorse, as penitence which could not issue in repentance, the sense of one's own vileness, and the like. The aim of punishment has been regarded as vindictive or vindicatory, as disciplinary and deterrent. Its duration has been most commonly taught as endless, based on such considerations as the continuance of penalty commensurate with that of blessedness, the limitation of redemption to the present life, the total absence of even common grace in the world of the lost, and the inability of the sinful soul to change itself. From early times here and there voices have been raised in advocacy of a limit to this condition, either through annihilation or restoration, or a gradual mitigation of the severity of retributive suffering. Yet even when theoretic considerations have inclined toward milder views, the demands of the religious appeal have often enforced the more rigid interpretation. Christian belief has preponderated on the whole in one direction, but it has never been crystallized into a dogmatic formula.

3. Tendencies of Recent Discussions.

Present day discussions of future punishment direct attention to four principal points—its nature, purpose, degree, and duration. It is no longer conceived in terms of material fire, but as spiritual experience, regarded by some as a positive infliction by God, by others as natural and in accord with immanent and universal moral order, again as a gradual wasting away of the organic powers of the being or as a divine judgment in which the very personality ceases to exist. Its purpose is either vindicatory or deterrent or disciplinary. As to duration, it is held to be either irreversible, whether immediately at death or at the latest after the judgment, or else as continuing for a temporary period only, determined by the force of resistance to God or by the degree of sin, thereafter to issue in a final restoration to harmony with God or in an extinction of the being. By reason of the limitation of human experience to the present world, however, man is unable to picture the form of the punishment; but since the moral order is universal, character and condition are known as inseparable, in the moral consciousness are found the principle and law of retribution—the principle that of accountability, the law that of cause and effect. Moral obligation and penalty originate and are realized in the same relations. Punishment is essentially ethical—how ethical one can understand by comparing Jesus' teaching with that of his own or of a later period. Jesus did indeed speak of outer darkness, fire, the undying worm; but he more commonly represented punishment as taking place in ethical relations, e.g., that of payment in kind. Penalty is often conceived as suffering. This interpretation may be traced in part to experience of civil punishment, in part to the stinging pain of a quickened and reproaching conscience, and in part to a literal use of the New Testament. But there is moral stupor as well as anguish; men are "past feeling," "branded as with a hot iron." It is a common belief that the circumstances of the other life will be radically different from the present, and that therefore insensibility will give place to awakened and remorseful suffering. But on the one hand it is conjectural whether, from the moral order of the world as known through revelation and experience, there is sufficient reason to believe that at the instant of death the torpid conscience, the unresponsive will, the insensible heart will be quickened to preternatural and unending activity; and on the other hand, so long as the moral nature, memory, and vicissitude are real in a moral and spiritual universe, the sinner may waken to fierce and uncontrollable remorse.

4. Two Leading Views.

There are two leading views as to the purpose of punishment—retribution and prevention. As retributive, the evil-doer receives back the consequences of his deeds; punishment demonstrates the nullity of his moral rebellion. This may be the experience of vengeance, of public sentiment, or of the deserts of the sinner. As preventive, punishment is deterrent or reformatory. He who suffers for his wrong-doing deters others from a like course of action; while reformatory punishment recalls the sinner to himself, to his folly and the inefficacy of his action, to his wickedness, so that in the moral arrest he may become aware of the pleading ideal of his own higher nature and the benign good-will of God. Whether the retributive shall be the only aspect of punishment in the sinner's condition after death must from the analogy of the earthly life be determined in part by the soul itself. No final decision on this subject can, however, ignore the universal Fatherhood of God and his eternal moral government.

5. Endlessness.

Concerning the endlessness of future punishment, the mind can form no adequate notion (cf. Edwards, *Works*, vi. 451). Arguments for its endlessness are drawn from many directions. (1) Words and pictures in the New Testament imply finality. (2) Preterition or reprobation of some here below renders future salvation for such impossible. (3) The offers of pardon are restricted to the present world. (4) The judgment occurs at the close of the redemp-

tive era, and hence is final. (5) Every single sin unrepented of deserves endless retribution. (6) Character tends to final permanence, as seen in the strengthening of the wrong decision, the consequent bondage of the will, and the intensifying of the sinful opposition to God in view of punishment experienced; naturally, final permanence can be attained but once. (7) The conscience expects and demands unending retribution in another life. (8) Finally, reference is made to the long history of this belief, and the eminent supporters of it in every age. Relief from the painful conclusion here reached is sought in many ways: appeal to human ignorance; a probationary period between death and the judgment for those who in this life have not finally refused God (see PROBATION, FUTURE); the incompatibility of the ultimate loss of any soul with the perfection of the Creator; the injustice of everlasting punishment for sins committed during the short span of the earthly life; continuance of punishment for a time after death, but God will finally succeed in his purpose of grace, or, on the other hand, the incorrigible will be eventually worn out with their punishment. See ESCHATOLOGY.

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject is invariably treated as a section of systematic theology, and therefore the works cited under DOGMA, DOGMATICS may be consulted. Much of the literature under the articles on ESCHATOLOGY; GEHENNA; PROBATION, FUTURE; UNIVERSALISM, and related topics is pertinent. Consult further: M. Stuart, *Future Punishments*, in vol. iii. of *Philological Tracts*, in *Biblical Cabinet*, 45 vols., Edinburgh, 1838–44; R. W. Hamilton, *Revealed Doctrine of Rewards and Punishments*, London, 1853; H. M. Dexter, *The Verdict of Reason upon the . . Future Punishment of . the Impenitent*, Boston, 1865; S. C. Bartlett, *Future Punishment*, ib. 1875; [J. M. Whiton], *Is "Eternal" Punishment Endless?* ib. 1876; N. Adams, *Endless Punishment: Scriptural Argument for . . future endless Punishment*, ib. 1878; E. Beecher, *Hist. of Opinions on the Scriptural Doctrine of Retribution*, New York, 1878; G. P. Fisher, in his *Discussions in Hist. and Theology*, ib. 1880; E. M. Goulburn, *Everlasting Punishment*, ib. 1880; J. B. Reimensnyder, *Doom Eternal*, Philadelphia, 1880; T. J. Sawyer, *Endless Punishment*, Boston, 1880 (Universalist); F. W. Farrar, *Mercy and Judgment*, London, 1881; idem, *Eternal Hope*, ib. 1892; W Griffith, *Evidence of the Evangelists and Apostles on Future Punishment*, ib. 1882; R. H. McKim, *Future Punishment*, New York, 1883; V M. de Lizzi, *De diuturnitate pœnarum*, Naples, 1884; C. A. Row, *Future Retribution in the Light of Reason and Revelation*, New York, 1887; W. G. T. Shedd, *The Doctrine of Endless Punishment*, ib. 1887 (perhaps the strongest affirmative statement of the doctrine since Edwards); J. Macpherson, *The Larger Hope*, London, 1890; S. M. Vernon, *Probation and Punishment*, New York, 1890; *Wider Hope, Essays and Strictures upon the Doctrine and Literature of Future Punishment, with Bibliographical Appendix*, London, 1890; R. L. Bellamy, *The Harvest of the Soul*, ib. 1902; J. Mew, *Traditional Aspects of Hell, Ancient and Modern*, ib. 1903; J. Bautz, *Die Hölle*, Mainz, 1905; L. B. Hartman, *Divine Penology*, New York, 1905; J. R. Norrie, *Eternal Torment: is it a possible human Destiny?* ib. 1905.

FUTURE STATE. See ESCHATOLOGY, §§ 6–7.

G

GABLER, gä'bler, JOHANN PHILIPP: German theologian; b. at Frankfort-on-the-Main June 4, 1753; d. at Jena Feb. 17, 1826. He studied for ten years at the gymnasium of his native town, and from 1772 to 1778 was a student at Jena, where Griesbach and Eichhorn were his teachers in theology. After filling minor positions in Frankfort (1778) and Göttingen (1780), and after officiating as professor at the gymnasium at Dortmund (1783), he was called to Altdorf in 1785 as deacon and professor of theology. In 1804 he was called to the University of Jena, and in 1812 he succeeded his former teacher, Griesbach, as professor of theology there. As a theological author Gabler is chiefly known by his edition of Eichhorn's *Urgeschichte*, to which he added a preface and notes (2 vols., Altdorf and Nuremberg, 1790–93), also by a number of Latin and German essays, several of which appeared in his periodicals: *Neuestes theologisches Journal* (1798–1800), *Journal für theologische Literatur* (1801–04), and *Journal für auserlesene theologische Literatur* (1805–11). Some of these minor works are devoted to church history, and others to dogmatics, but the greater number consist of expositions and criticisms of narratives and sayings of the New Testament. In tendency Gabler was naturalistic and rationalistic. A collection of his essays, lectures, and Latin programs and speeches was published by his sons, Theodor August and Johann Gottfried Gabler (2 vols., Ulm, 1831), with an autobiographical sketch written for Eichstädt's *Annales academiæ Jenensis* (Jena, 1823).

(E. HENKE†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W Schröter, *Erinnerungen an J. B. Gabler*, Jena, 1827; G. Thomasius, *Das Wiedererwachen des evangelischen Lebens in der lutherischen Kirche Bayerns*, pp. 21 sqq., Erlangen, 1867.

GABRIEL SEVERUS: Greek metropolitan and theologian; b. at Monemvasia (45 m. s.e. of Sparta) 1541; d. at Venice Oct. 21, 1616. After completing his education at Padua, he resided in Crete and at Venice, where the Greek colony chose him priest of St. George in 1573. Four years later he was made metropolitan of Philadelphia, but continued to live at Venice. He was one of the most learned theologians of the modern Greek Church, whose claims he passionately defended against Roman Catholicism and the unionistic tendencies within his own communion. The first of his three chief works was the collection of three treatises on the honor due the sacred elements of the Eucharist, the "portions" (Gk. *merides*, pieces of bread set aside at the Eucharist in honor of the Virgin and the saints, and for the spiritual welfare of all orthodox Christians, whether living or dead), and the boiled wheat distributed to the congregation on certain days, generally in memory of the dead. This was first published at Venice in 1604. His second work was the "Treatise on the Holy and Sacred Mysteries" (1600), of which separate portions have been edited at various times. In its presentation the book is scholastic and not altogether free from

unconscious approximations to Roman Catholic doctrines. The chief work of Severus is his "Exposition against those who ignorantly say and unlawfully teach that we, the true and orthodox Children of the Eastern Church, are Schismatics from the Holy andCatholic Church." Of this only the first portion has been published (*Ogdoas scriptorum græcorum* by N. Metaxas, Constantinople, 1627). It is a polemic against the Roman Catholics, occasioned by the charge of the Jesuits Possevino and Bellarmine that the Greek Catholics were heretics. In his work he seeks to show what are the differences between the Roman and Greek Churches, which is the true Church, and the proof that the Orthodox possess the true faith and are neither schismatics nor heretics. Severus wrote little except in systematic theology, although he collaborated in Sir Henry Savile's edition of Chrysostom (Eton, 1612). Certain anecdota are given by Legrand, while some of his letters have been edited by G. Lami, M. Crusius, and others. (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Simon, *Fides ecclesiæ orientalis, seu Gabrielis Metropolitæ Philadelphiensis*, Paris, 1671; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, xi. 625, Hamburg, 1808; E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique*, Paris, 1885 sqq.

GABRIEL SIONITA: A learned Maronite; b. at Edden, Mount Lebanon, in northern Palestine, 1577; d. in Paris 1648. At the age of seven he entered the Maronite college at Rome, where he studied and taught till 1614. Through the French ambassador, Cardinal du Perron, he was persuaded to go to Paris to collaborate on a proposed polyglot Bible. In Jan., 1615, he was appointed professor of Arabic and Syriac at the Sorbonne. He took his doctorate in theology in 1620 and became a priest in the same year. After many interruptions the Paris Polyglot was taken up by Michel le Jay in 1630 and finished in 1645, Gabriel furnishing the Arabic and Syriac versions (see BIBLES, POLYGLOT). On account of his unruliness and alleged inaccuracy, the editors of the Bible discharged him in 1640 and called Abraham Ecchellensis (q.v.) to take his place. They even induced Richelieu to put Gabriel in prison at Vincennes, but after three months he secured his liberty and resumed his former position, on promising to deliver the Arabic and Syriac versions. He published several works in Arabic, Latin, and Italian, including: *Geographia Nubiensis* (Rome, 1592; Paris, 1619); and *Grammatica Arabica Maronitarum* (Paris, 1616).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Le Long, *Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. Masch, 5 vols., Halle, 1778–90; C. P. Goujet, *Mémoires historiques et littéraires sur le collège royal de France*, vol. iii., Paris, 1758; C. G. Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, iv. 619, Leipsic, 1787; *KL*, v. 4–5.

GABRIELS, HENRY: Roman Catholic bishop of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; b. at Wanneghem, Belgium, Oct. 6, 1838. He studied at Audenarde (1852–57), St. Nicolas (1857–58), Ghent (1858–60), and the University of Louvain (S.T.L., 1864). He taught theology in St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N. Y., 1864–92 and was president of the same institution 1871–1892, in addition to being vicar-general for Ogdensburg and Burlington, and diocesan examiner for New York and Albany. In 1892 he was consecrated bishop of Ogdensburg. He has written *Quæstiones Mechlinienses in rubricas breviarii et missalis Romani* (New York, 1887) and *Rudiments of the Hebrew Grammar* (a translation of the seventh edition of the *Rudimenta linguæ Hebraicæ* of C. H. Vosen and F. Kaulen; St. Louis, Mo., 1891).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A sketch of his life is found in the *Monograph Series* of the U. S. Catholic Historical Society, iii. 7–16, New York, 1905.

GAD: The name of a Canaanitic deity of fortune. In Isa. lxv. 11 (A.V.) occur the words: "But ye are they that prepare a table for that troop" (the Hebrew of which is better rendered in the R.V. "that prepare a table for Fortune"; margin "Gad," Gk. *tōi daimoniōi*). The "Gad" of the R.V margin reproduces the Hebrew, which is evidently a proper name introduced in connection with Meni (q.v.), both Gad and Meni being deities worshiped by apostate Israelites in the worship of the former of which a table (lectisternium) was spread. This is the only unquestionable mention of the deity in the Old Testament. Other traces occur, however, which make probable the fact of an extensively propagated cult of Canaanitic or Aramean origin. Thus a place named Baal-gad, "Lord of (good) fortune," situated "in the valley of Lebanon under mount Hermon" is given as the extreme northern limit of Joshua's conquest (Josh. xi. 17, xii. 7, xiii. 5); while Migdal-gad, "Tower of Gad," appears as a place in the southwest lowlands of Judah (Josh. xv. 37). In Gen. xxx. 11 (belonging to the J narrative) at the birth of Zilpah's first son her mistress is said to have exclaimed "a troop cometh," R.V., "Fortunate!" margin, "fortune!" or "Fortune is come" (an attempt to render in the R.V more closely the Hebrew *begad* or *ba gad*). The Talmudists understood this exclamation to refer to the god Gad in the sense of "Gad is here, bringing good fortune," but later commentators are much divided over the sense of the passage. Since from the passage in Isaiah (and other evidences to be adduced) it is clear that Gad is the name of a deity, it would be expected that the word would be found as an element in proper names. In Num. xiii. 10 appears mention of a "Gaddiel the son of Sodi," and in xiii. 11 of "Gaddi the son of Susi," the latter possibly a shortened form of the former; in II Kings xv. 14, 17 Menahem is called "the son of Gadi" (Septuagint, Gaddi), and possibly "Gad" in I Sam. xxii. 5 is a form still more simplified. Azgad, "Strong is Gad," as the name of a clan or a chief, appears in Ezra ii. 12, viii. 12; Neh. x. 15. While all of these names do not necessarily contain conscious reference to a deity, there is a probability that, in the light of known practises of later Jews, at least some of them may have been formed with the god in mind. The practise of spreading the lectisternium for Gad continued in some Jewish families as late as the eleventh century, this in a way vouching for the worship mentioned in Isaiah, while Buxtorf (*Lexicon talmudicum*) adduces the custom of keeping in the house a couch called "the couch of Gada," finely fitted up, never used by the family, but reserved for "the prince of the house," i.e., the protector "Fortune."

In other Semitic regions the name appears as an

element in names, though the meaning can not always be determined. In most cases it is possible to take the element Gad as an appellative, "fortune." Thus there are found in very different provenance the combinations Gad-Nebo, "Fortune of Nebo," and Gad-shirath. So in a number of Palmyrene inscriptions the word occurs in combinations where the second element is the name of another deity, e.g., Gad-Allat, while *gadya*, "fortunate," occurs. One Palmyrene inscription found at a sacred spring points indubitably to a deity to whom the spring was sacred, reading "to Gada" (cf. the place name "Ayin-Gada," Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xxix., 1875, 441) and the "Gad-spring" near Jerusalem. In Phenician and Carthaginian environment the word is found as an element in personal names, while in many more probable cases the reading is not suffieiently clear to give entire certainty; moreover the meaning can not always be definitely determined and may be appellative. *Gad-melek*, "Gad is king," is an inscription on a stone found in Jerusalem, possibly due to Canaanitic influence. In Arabic the proper name Abd al-Gadd is found, certainly a deity's name (Wellhausen, *Heidentum*, p. 146). Isaac of Antioch (*Opera*, ed. Bickell, ii. 210, Giessen, 1877) reports that tables were prepared on the roofs by his countrymen for *Gadda* or (pl.) *Gadde*, and he mentions a "demon" Gadlat as belonging to the city of Beth-hur. Jacob of Sarug speaks of a female goddess of Haran named Gadlat, while by the plural *gadde* he means demons. It is noteworthy that both of these references fall in with what is shown by comparative religion as happening within the Semitic sphere; (1) the development of a shadowy consort corresponding in name to the male deity, and (2) in a subsequent stage of development or under another religion the degradation of both deities to the rank of demons. Post-Christian Jews, especially the rabbis, used the name as that of a demon. Temples of Gad were known in Syria, and Buxtorf cites a passage which speaks of an image of Gad. Jacob of Sarug says that "on the summit of the mountains they now build monasteries instead of *beit-gadde*" (i.e., temples to Jupiter and Venus, who were identified with the deities of good luck). In late times Gad appears to have been so popular that his name acquired the sense of "genius, godhead." Under the Greek régime Gad seems to have passed over into the Greek form Tychē, who is very often mentioned on coins and in inscriptions in the region of Syria and became a patron of very many Greek cities, possibly also the patron of rulers. The Greek Tychē is unquestionably not of native Greek origin, but is an importation from the East, and on Greek soil was sometimes masculine. Whether the Syrian Tychē is the earlier Gad, renamed under Greek influence, can not be definitely decided, as the data are not yet sufficiently numerous or continuous.

The origin of the god Gad is in doubt. It is possible that he arose as the personification of the abstract concept good fortune, though it must be said that this process is not usual in the Semitic sphere. None of the Old Testament passages which bear on the question are very early, unless the view of the critical school be correct which inclines to the belief that the tribe of Gad, like that of Asher, took its name from the god. The newer explanation of the composite origin of the Hebrew nation as including clans absorbed by conquest, tradition recording this fact by assigning to the clans so absorbed a humbler origin as the descendants of concubines, would make for an early origin of the deity. But these conclusions are by no means universally accepted, and the worship, even the existence, of Gad in strictly Canaanitic provenance earlier than the Exile rests on the two place names Baal-gad and Migdal-gad (ut sup.).

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Selden, *De dis Syris*, I., i., London, 1617, and the additions of Beyer in ed. of Amsterdam, 1680; F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, i. 174, Bonn, 1841; D. A. Chwolson, *Die Asabier*, ii. 226–227, St. Petersburg, 1856; W. W. von Baudissin, *Jahve et Moloch*, pp. 36 sqq., Leipsic, 1874; F. Lenormant, *Chaldaean Magic*, p. 120, London, 1877; J. H. Mordtmann, in *ZDMG*, xxxi (1877), 99–101, xxxix (1885), 44–46; P. Scholz, *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den Hebräern*, pp. 409–411, Regensburg, 1877; C. G. A. Siegfried, in *JPT*, i (1875), 356–367; F. W. A. Baethgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 76–80, 159–161, Berlin, 1888; T. Nöldeke, in *ZDMG*, xlii (1888), 479 sqq.; G. Kerber, *Die religiongeschichtliche Bedeutung der hebräischen Eigennamen*, pp. 66–68, Freiburg, 1897; the commentaries of Dillmann, Cheyne, Delitzsch, and G. A. Smith on Isaiah, on the passage lxv. 11, of Delitzsch on Genesis, at xxx. 11, and T. K. Cheyne, *Introduction to Book of Isaiah*, pp. 365–366, London, 1895; *DB*, ii. 76; *EB*, ii. 1557–1558, "Fortune."

GADARA, GADARENES. See GERASENES; PERÆA.

GAETANO, gā″ê-tā′nō (CAJETAN), OF TIENE. See THEATINES.

GAILOR, THOMAS FRANK: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Tennessee; b. at Jackson, Miss., Sept. 17, 1856. He studied at Racine College, Racine, Wis. (B.A., 1876), and at the General Theological Seminary (S.T.B., 1879), and was ordered deacon in 1879 and ordained priest in 1880. After being rector of the Church of the Messiah at Pulaski, Tenn., 1879–82, he was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of the South, where he was also chaplain after 1883 and vice-chancellor after 1890. He was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Tennessee in 1893, and became bishop five years later, on the death of Bishop Quintard. He has been a member of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church since 1886 and a member of many important committees, such as that on marginal readings in 1895–1902. He is at present chairman of the Court of Review for ecclesiastical trials in the fourth department of the Church. In theology he is a High-churchman with wide sympathies. He has written *A Manual of Devotion* (New York, 1887) and *The Apostolic Succession* (1890).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 357, New York, 1895.

GAINES, WESLEY JOHN: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. a slave, near Washington, Ga., Oct 4, 1840. Until the age of fifteen he remained on the plantation where he was born, acquiring an elementary education by his own efforts, while his theological training was obtained later, especially in 1870, from Protestant Episcopal clergy. In 1855

he was taken to Stewart County, Ga., and in the following year to Muscogee County in the same State. He was licensed to preach (1865), was admitted to the South Carolina Conference (1866), and was ordained deacon and elder (1867). He was stationed at Florence Mission, Ga. (1867), Atlanta (1867–69), Macon (1871–73), Columbus (1874–77), again at Macon (1878–80), and Atlanta (1881–88). In 1888 he was elected bishop. He has been a trustee of Wilberforce University, Ohio, vice-president of Payne Theological Seminary, president of the board of trustees of Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Fla., and the founder of Morris Brown College, Atlanta, of which he is also trustee and treasurer. He is likewise president of the financial board of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and has written *African Methodism in the South* (Atlanta, 1890).

GALATEO, gā''lā-tê'ō, GIROLAMO. See ITALY, THE REFORMATION IN, § 3.

GALATIA. See ASIA MINOR, VII.

GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE. See PAUL THE APOSTLE.

GALBANUM. See INCENSE, I., § 3.

GALE, THEOPHILUS: English non-conformist; b. at Kingsteignton (12 m. s.s.w. of Exeter), Devonshire, 1628; d. at Newington, London, Feb. or Mar., 1678. He studied at Magdalen Hall, Oxford (B.A., 1649; M.A., 1652), and in 1650 received the fellowship of one of the ejected fellows. After having distinguished himself as a university preacher, he accepted an appointment as preacher in Winchester Cathedral in 1657, but retained his fellowship. At the Restoration he lost his preferments and became a tutor to the children of Lord Wharton. He traveled abroad with his pupils 1662–65, and on the termination of his engagement in 1666, he settled at Newington, London, as assistant pastor to John Rowe, whom he succeeded in 1677 On his death he left his theological library to Harvard College. Gale is known by his *Court of the Gentiles* (parts i. and ii., Oxford, 1669–71; parts iii. and iv., London, 1677; 2d. ed., London, 1682), which is a learned attempt to trace all European languages back to Hebrew and to prove that all ancient philosophy and theology were derived from the Hebrew Scriptures. Among Gale's other works are: *A True Idea of Jansenism* (London, 1669); *Anatomy of Infidelity* (1672); and *Idea Theologiæ* (1673).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii. 451, 750, 778, London, 1692; E. Calamy, *Historical Account*, pp. 64–65, ib. 1713; S. Palmer, *Nonconformist's Memorial*, i. 239, ib. 1802; *DNB*, xx. 377–378.

GALERIUS: Roman emperor, 293–311. See DIOCLETIAN.

GALFRID, gāl'frîd (GAUFRID, GOTTFRID), OF CLAIRVAUX: Cistercian abbot; d. after 1188. He was born at Auxerre, and was a pupil of Abelard, but obtained Bernard's favor in 1140, and later became his secretary (*notarius*). In 1159 he was made abbot of the monastery at Igny, in 1162 of Clairvaux, but had to give up this position in 1167. In 1170 he became abbot of Fossanova, near Rome, in 1176 of Hautecombe in Savoy. The most important part of Galfrid's activity refers to Bernard of Clairvaux, of whose biography he wrote books iii.–v. and the third part of book vi., besides collecting materials. For the proceedings against Gilbert of Poitiers at Reims in 1149 he collected patristic quotations against him and published them afterward (*MPL*, clxxxv. 595–618). At the request of the order he also wrote a biography of the archbishop Peter of Tarentaise. Commentaries on the Song of Songs, on the Apocalypse, and sermons are still extant in manuscript. Galfrid nowhere develops any new thoughts nor does he betray any deep conception of persons and things, but he shows a certain ability in the way of presentation. His unlimited admiration of Bernard and his hostility to Abelard and Gilbert make it necessary to accept his statements with caution.

S. M. DEUTSCH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Mabillon, Introduction to the *Vitæ Bernardi*, in *MPL*, clxxxv. 221 sqq.; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiv. 430–451; H. Reuter, *Alexander III.*, vol. ii., Leipsic, 1862; G. Hüffer, *Der heilige Bernhard von Clairvaux*, i. 27 sqq., Münster, 1886; E. Vacandard, *Vie de St. Bernard*, Paris, 1895; *KL*, v. 932–933.

GALFRID OF VENDÔME: Abbot of the cloister at Vendôme from 1093; d. at Angers Mar. 26, 1132. When Pope Urban II. (q.v.) fell into sore straits under the party of the antipope Clement III., Galfrid hastened to Rome and rendered such great service that he was appointed a cardinal-priest, and received still further tokens of the pope's good-will. He enjoyed favorable relations with Paschal II. as well; also with Calixtus II. and Honorius II. In church history at large, Galfrid is a factor of some significance on account of his share in the investiture controversy (see INVESTITURE); he belonged to those of the clergy who stoutly demanded the revocation of the privilege of investiture conferred by Paschal II. on the German king. He was the author of certain minor teleological writings.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gottfried's *Epistolæ*, *libelli* and *Opuscula* were edited by J. Sirmond, Paris, 1610, and are also in *MPL*, clvii. The *libelli*, ed. E. Sackur, are in *MGH*, *Libelli de lite*, ii (1893), 680–700. Consult: *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xi. 180; L. Compain, *Étude sur Geoffroi de Vendôme*, Paris, 1891; E. Sackur, in *NA*, xviii (1893), 666–673; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, Leipsic, 1894.

GALILEE.

I. The Israelitic Period.
Names and Boundaries (§ 1).
History (§ 2).
Cities (§ 3).
II. The Jewish Period.
Geographical Limits (§ 1).
Earlier History (§ 2).
Galilee the Home of Insurrection (§ 3).
Cities (§ 4).

Galilee (Hebr. *Galil;* Aram. *Galila, Gelila;* Gk. *Hē Galilaia*) is the most northern district of Palestine. The form of the name indicates two distinct periods in the history of the region, the Israelitic and the Jewish.

I. The Israelitic Period: The word *Galil* or *Galilah* (II Kings xv. 29) means a circle, region, district. It is used nearly in its primary sense in Isa. ix. 1 (cf. I Macc. v. 15), and suggests in these passages a region not in the complete possession of the Hebrews. The passage in Isaiah defines the region closely enough, mentioning on one side Zebulun and Naphtali, on the other "beyond

Jordan," and also "the way of the sea," which is the caravan route from Damascus to Acre via Bahrat al-Hulah, Wadi al-Hammam and past Karn Hattin, and also the "district of the nations" (R. V margin). The region through which this road passes beyond Karn Hattin is the land of Zebulun; the Jordan region is the stretch on the west side from Bahrat al-Hulah to Dan. The "district of the nations" includes the mountain region to the north of the plain of al Battof (cf. Josh. xx. 7 and II Kings xv. 29). The last two expressions in Isa. ix. 1 correspond to the "land of Naphtali" in the preceding context.

1. Names and Boundaries.

The earliest reports of this region come from the inscriptions of Sethos I. and Rameses II. (fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C.) in connection with the conquered territory between the Kishon and Lebanon, in which Asher is mentioned. By this is not necessarily meant the tribe of Asher, since the incriptions clearly mean a country. Gen. xxx. 9–13 makes Asher a son of Jacob and Zilpah, the bondservant of Leah, that is, a stock of mixed Hebrew and Canaanitic blood: or, in other words, Hebrew settlers in the district of Asher had assumed the name of the region, though they had in time become its masters. A similar explanation applies to the case of Naphtali as the son of Jacob and Bilhah, the bondservant of Rachel (Gen. xxx. 1–8). The two Canaanitic stocks out of which these peoples developed were the Amorites and the Hivites. The Amorites came from Lebanon later than 1250 B.C.; the Hivites dwelt at the foot of Hermon (Josh. xi. 3) or Lebanon (Judges iii. 3). In the Song of Deborah, Naphtali and Zebulun receive praise, while Asher is charged with indifference and lack of effort, but in Judges vi. 35, vii. 23, Asher is reckoned among the fighting tribes. The indications of history and of Judges i. 31–33 are that the district of Asher was less under Hebrew control than that of Naphtali. But it is clear from the reading of events that the population of the region had little influence at least upon the religion of Israel. Solomon ceded to Hiram of Tyre twenty cities in Galilee which belonged to the region of Cabul (I Kings ix. 10–14) which Hiram gave to Solomon (II Chron. viii. 2), though the history in the Books of Kings does not bear out the Chronicler. Benhadad I. wasted "all the land of Naphtali" (I Kings xv. 20); after the victory of Ahab it was again recovered by Hazael (II Kings xii. 18, xiii. 22), and Jeroboam was able to restore the control to Israel, though only for a short time. In 734 B.C. Tiglath-pileser III. assailed this entire region at the request of Ahaz (II Kings xvi. 7) and carried the inhabitants into exile (II Kings xv. 29). The harassed condition of the inhabitants is expressed in Isa. iii. 21, ix. 4. The Israelitic period ends with the assimilation of the region to the Assyrian rule.

2. History.

The Galilee of Israelitic times possessed no large cities. It was not easily accessible, since there were no good roads, and the caravan route passed through its southeastern corner only. One road passed eastward from Tyre to Abel-beth-maacah, and crossed several leading north and south; there was a path from Tyre to the Sea of Galilee, and one from Acre, more traveled, which branched on the hills northward and southward. Judges xviii. 7–10 probably represents the condition of all the places called cities in Galilee. Josh. xi. 10 names Hazor as the capital, one of Solomon's border fortresses (I Kings ix. 15), while I Macc. xi. 63–73 locates it south of Kedesh. Kedesh was one of the oldest possessions of Israel; its modern name is Kades, located north of Bahrat al-Hulah. Its name indicates that it was an old sanctuary, and Josh. xx. 7, xxi. 32 make it a city of refuge and a Levitical city. North of Kedesh, on the border of the hill country above the Jordan valley, lay Abel-beth-maacah, the modern Abil al-Kamh, the refuge of Sheba (II Sam. xx. 14). Still farther north lay Ijon, not definitely located, though there is a Marj Ajun between the Litany and the Hasbany. Dan was situated eastward from Abil al-Kamh, on the west source of the Jordan (Judges xviii., Josh. xix. 47). Its earlier name was Lais or Leshem. Jeroboam made it one of the royal sanctuaries, and it stood for the extreme northern boundary of Israel. Achshaph (Josh. xi. 1) is possibly the modern Khirbat Iksaf, southwest of the bend in the Litany. The village Jarun west of Bahrat al-Hulah perhaps marks the Iron of Josh. xix. 38, Kana, south of this, may be the Kanah of Josh. xix. 28, and Ramiya, still farther south, the Ramah of Josh. xix. 29.

3. Cities.

II. The Jewish Period: The boundaries of the Jewish Galilee differed from those under Israel. Josephus makes it begin on the north of Scythopolis and the Plain of Jezreel, and divides it into Upper and Lower Galilee, with the division at the plain of al-Ramah, with Beersheba on the line. While the Sea of Galilee and the Jordan were normally the eastern boundary, places farther east were reckoned to it (see GAULANITIS). The northern and western boundaries are hard to define, though Josephus makes Kedesh a Tyrian fortress on the boundary. The Jewish Galilee included the territory of Zebulun, which was not in the earlier district. Dr. Hirsch Hildesheimer (*Beiträge zur Geographie Palästinas*, Berlin, 1886) from indications in the Talmud would place the northern line by Tibnin, Marj Ajun and Cæsarea Philippi in the time of Alexander Jannæus. But it is hardly likely that Kedesh had changed its relations between his time and that of Josephus.

1. Geographical Limits.

Despite the exemplary punishment meted out to the district by Tiglath-pileser III., the Israelitic inhabitants continued for the most part to hold their position, and it did not suffer the same admixture of foreign population as did Samaria. The narrative in II Chron. xxx. 10–11 supports the supposition that there were those in the country about 300 B.C. who were allied in religion with the Jews; and that Jews lived in that country is shown by I Macc. v. 14–23, in that Simon the Maccabee brought numbers of Jews thence to live in Judea. Under John Hyrcanus I. Samaria was subjected and the boundaries thrust farther north to Galilee. Aristobulus I. seems to have conquered and Judaized

2. Earlier History.

Galilee (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII., xi. 3), and Hyrcanus II. was confirmed by Pompey as ethnarch of the region. The later destiny of Galilee was bound up with that of Judea. The proconsul Gabinius divided the whole Jewish country into five districts, each with its own synedrium, that for Galilee sitting in Sepporis. But this arrangement did not prove satisfactory. The risings of the years 55 and 53 B.C. were suppressed by the Romans, but Herod first secured peace in the land 45 B.C. After the rule of Antigonus, 40–37, Galilee was united with Herod's kingdom (37–4 B.C.), and Augustus gave Herod also the tetrarchy of Zenodorus. After the death of Herod, hatred of the Romans and hopes of the Messiah kindled the fires of insurrection. Judas of Gamala, son of an Ezechias executed by Herod, rebelled and was subdued by Varus (see JUDAS OF GALILEE). Meanwhile Augustus had confirmed Herod's will and Galilee and Peræa fell to Antipas, who made his capital first in Sepporis and then in Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee. While the census of Quirinius (7 A.D.) did not affect Galilee, it set loose forces of insurrection. The Zealots arose under Judas of Gamala and the Pharisee Zaddok. Judas was killed (Acts v. 37), but he had sown seed which produced fruit. Both John the Baptist and Jesus found Zealots among their disciples (John i. 35–42; Mark iii. 18). These continued movements caused Antipas great anxiety (Luke xiii. 31, 32). An event of the year 40 showed how great was the feeling against the Romans. Caligula had ordered Petronius, the governor of Syria, to place the emperor's statue in the Temple at Jerusalem, and thousands of Jews assembled in Ptolemais and Tiberias, in the latter place continuously for forty days, beseeching him not to profane the Temple, and Petronius gave up the design. From the year 44 the Zealots continued to gain ground among the people, though treated by the Romans as common brigands. By a gift of Nero, part of Galilee came under Agrippa II., viz., Tiberias and Tarichæa. At the beginning of the war in 67, Sepporis yielded to the Romans and the other cities, Tarichæa, Tiberias, Gamala, and the fortress on Tabor and at Gischala were subdued. After 70, Vespasian took the entire district, so rife with sedition, under his private control, and Judea was administered by governors probably of pretorian rank. Agrippa's realm after his death in 100 was joined to the province of Syria.

3. Galilee the Home of Insurrection.

A review shows that the population of Galilee was heterogeneous. Besides the Jews, themselves not of pure strain, there were Arameans, Itureans (perhaps Arabs), to say nothing of Phenicians and Greeks. On this account the contempt of the Jews for Galileans is explicable (John i. 46, vii. 52), and the dialect was distinguishable from that used in the south (Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70). Nevertheless in the second century Galilee became the home of Jewish scholarship, the place where the Masoretic work was done upon the text of the Old Testament and where the beginning was made of the collection which became the Jerusalem or Palestinian Talmud.

The best-known cities belonged to Lower Galilee. Near the southwestern boundary and south of the Wadi al-Malak lay Simonias, the Shimron of Josh. xi. 1, the modern Semuniyah. South of Tabor the modern Nein locates the Nain of Luke vii. 11. On the plateau between Tabor and the Sea of Galilee the modern village of Sarona locates the Saronas of Eusebius (*Onomasticon*, 296). In the time of Christ the region immediately west of the Sea of Galilee was densely populated. In the south, not far from the outlet into the Jordan, lay the Talmudic fortress Bethirah, to be identified with the Tarichæa of Josephus, the modern Khirbet al-Karak. Four miles north was the celebrated spring of Tiberias, with Tiberias itself half an hour farther north, according to the Talmud the site of the Rakkath of Josh. xix. 35. After Herod Antipas had built it, he found it difficult to get Jews to settle there, since they regarded it as unclean on account of the many graves in the vicinity or on the site. An hour still to the north is located the village al-Majdal, identified with the home of Mary Magdalene. From there to Khan Minyah stretches the plain, the Gennesaret of Mark vi. 53. On the location of Capernaum see CAPERNAUM. The best road from the shore of the Sea of Galilee westward is through the Wadi al-Hammam, where Herod's famous battle with the supporters of the Hasmoneans was fought (Josephus, *War*, I., xvi. 2, 4). The basalt hill of Karn Hattin is identified by the Roman Catholics as the Mount of Transfiguration, but without good reason. To the southwest is situated Kafr Kanna, often identified with the Cana of John ii.; others locate Cana at Khirbet Kana, and a third identification is with Kanat al-Jalil, at the north of the plain of al-Battof. But half an hour north of Nazareth (q.v.) is a spring still known as Ain Kana, surrounded by masonry, and near it a basin of masonry. This site better fulfils the conditions required for the site of Cana. One and a half hours north of Nazareth is Safuriyah, which marks the site of Sepporis, a town by nature a fortress, and for that reason influential in history. Before Tiberias was built, it was the chief city of the district. In the north of the plain of al-Battof (plain of Asochis, *Ant.* XIII., xii. 4), at the modern Tell Jafat was the fortress of Jotapata (Josephus, *War*, III., vii.–viii.). In Upper Galilee, near the north shore of the Sea of Galilee and near Capernaum, the present Khirbet Karazah is the site of Chorazin (Matt. xi. 21). Upon a high spur, giving a wide view southward, was Zafed, a city reckoned with Jerusalem, Hebron, and Tiberias as one of the holy places. Westward lies Meron, often mentioned in the Talmud and still a place of pilgrimage for Jews who honor the doctors of the law buried there. Gischala lay to the north, the modern ruins bearing the name al-Jish.

4. Cities.

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, London, 1897; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i.–ii., Eng. transl., I., i., II., i.; A. Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, Paris, 1868; V. Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, III., *Galilée*, i.–ii., ib. 1880; C. R. Conder and H. H. Kitchener, *Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, vol. i., London, 1881; S. Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*, Boston, 1881; W M. Thomson, *Land and Book, Central*

Palestine, London, 1883; B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i., Berlin, 1887; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. iii., Index, "Galiläa," "Galiläer," "Zeloten," ib. 1888; W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, Leipsic, 1893; J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, Berlin, 1894; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palästina*, Freiburg, 1896; W. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 20–48, London, 1903; Robinson, *Researches*, vol. ii.; *DB*, ii. 98–104; *EB*, ii. 1628–36; *JE*, v. 553–554.

GALILEE, SEA OF: The body of water into which the Jordan widens north of the Dead Sea and south of Lake Huleh. In the Old and the New Testament several names are applied to it. In the Greek of the New Testament it appears as a *limnē* ("lake"; Luke v. 1, viii. 22–33), and as a *thalassa* ("sea"; John vi. 18, 23). In one place (Luke v. 1) it is called the Lake of Gennesaret, a name given also to the plain along the northwestern shore and to a town in the plain. Sea of Tiberias is the terminology in John vi. 1, xxi. 1, in the first passage also Sea of Galilee. The term Sea of Galilee is the best known to the New Testament, occurring Matt. iv. 18, xv. 29; Mark i. 16, vii. 31; John vi. 1. In the Old Testament it appears as the Sea of Chinnereth (Num. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xiii. 27) and the Sea of Chinneroth (Josh. xii. 3), variant forms of the same word, the origin of which is doubtful. I Macc. xi. 67 speaks of "the water of Gennesar." This body of water is thirteen miles long and nearly seven miles wide, less than 200 feet in depth, approximately an elongated oval in shape, and its surface is 700 feet below the Mediterranean. The northern and southern shores slope gently to the plain of the Jordan, while the eastern and western shores are terminated by the hills which rise abruptly on the east, less so on the west. It is subject to sudden storms of great violence which make its navigation always a matter of peril. Its waters swarm with fish, and one town, Bethsaida ("Home of Fishermen"), took its name from this fact. The most sacred associations of the lake are connected with the life of Jesus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For literature consult list under GALILEE.

GALILEO, gā″lî-lê′ō (properly **Galileo Galilei**): Italian physicist and astronomer; b. at Pisa Feb. 15, 1564; d. at Arcetri, near Florence, Jan. 8, 1642. In 1581 he entered the University of Pisa to study medicine and the Aristotelian philosophy, but soon abandoned medicine for mathematics and physical science. In 1585 he left the university and went to Florence to study under Otilio Ricci. He was professor of mathematics at Pisa 1589–91, and at Padua 1592–1610, lecturing there to crowds of enthusiastic pupils from all over Europe. In 1610 Cosmo II., grand duke of Tuscany, appointed him philosopher and mathematician at the Florentine court, thus relieving him of all academic routine and enabling him to devote himself entirely to his scientific investigations.

Galileo's opposition to the Ptolemaic cosmology first brought him under the suspicion of the Inquisition in 1611, though he continued his investigations and publicly defended the Copernican system. In a letter to his friend Father Castelli, dated Dec. 21, 1613, he maintained that the theologian, instead of trying to restrict scientific investigation on Biblical grounds, should make it his business to reconcile the phraseology of the Bible with the results of science. In 1615 a copy of this letter was produced before the Inquisition, with the result that the following year Galileo was warned by the pope to desist from his heretical teachings on the pain of imprisonment. In 1632 he again drew the attention of the Inquisition by publishing a defense of the Copernican system. After a long and wearisome trial he was condemned on June 22, 1633, solemnly to abjure his scientific creed on bended knees. This he did under threats of torture; but whether he was actually put to the torture is still a mooted question. He was also sentenced to indeterminate imprisonment, but this was soon commuted to residence at Sienna, and the following December he was allowed to return to his villa at Arcetri, though he remained under the surveillance of the Inquisition. In 1637 he became totally blind.

Galileo's chief contributions to science are his formulation of the laws governing falling bodies, the invention of the telescope, the discovery of the isochronism of the pendulum, and numerous astronomical discoveries, including the phases of Venus, four satellites of Jupiter, and the spots on the sun. His works were stricken from the Index in 1835. The most important are *Dialogo sopra i due sistemi del mondo* (Florence, 1632); and *Discorsi e demostrazioni matematichè intorno ò due nuove scienze* (Leyden, 1638; both these are in Eng. transl. by T. Salusbury, *The Systeme of the World, in Four Dialogues, wherein the two grond Systemes of Ptolemy and Copernicus are discoursed of, The ancient and modern Doctrine of Holy Fathers concerning the rash Citotion of the Testimony of Sacred Scripture in Conclusions merely natural. Mathematical Discourses and Demonstrations touching two new Sciences pertoining to Mechaniks and Local Motion with an Appendix of the Centre of Gravity of some Solids.—A Discourse concerning the Natation of Bodies upon the Water*, London, 1661; by J. Weston, London, 1730). The best editions of his works are that by E. Alberi (16 vols., Florence, 1842–56) and the new complete edition now being prepared by A. Favaro at the expense of the State (Florence, 1890 sqq.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Favaro, *Galileo Galilei*, Florence, 1883; F. Picavet, *Galilée, destructeur de la scolastique et fondateur de la philosophie scientifique*, Paris, 1895; *Private Life of Galileo*, London, 1869 (based on his correspondence with his daughters); H. de L'Épinois, *Galilée, son procès, sa condamnation, d'après les documents inédits*, Paris, 1878; K. von Gabler, *Galileo and the Roman Curia*, London, 1879; F. R. Wegg-Prosser, *Galileo and his Judges*, ib. 1889 (gives summary of the "Dialogue"); O. Lodge, *Pioneers in Science*, ib. 1892; D. Nasmith, *Makers of Modern Thought*, 2 vols., ib. 1892; A. D. White, *Warfare of Science with Theology*, 2 vols., New York, 1896; J. J. Fahie, *Galileo, his Life and Work*, London, 1903; *KL*, v. 18–44 (Roman Catholic, gives good list of literature). A. Favaro, professor of law in the University of Padua, has published in Italian "Galileo and the Inquisition," 1907, giving the original documents referring to Galileo's prosecution from the archives of the Vatican and the Holy Office.

GALITZIN, gą-lit′zin (**GALLITZIN, GOLIZYN**), **ADELHEID AMALIE, PRINCESS.** See OVERBERG, BERNHARD HEINRICH.

GALL, SAINT. See SAINT GALL, MONASTERY OF.

GALLAGHER, CHARLES WESLEY: Methodist Episcopalian; b. at Boston Feb. 3, 1846. He studied at Wesleyan University (B.A., 1870), and held pastorates at Guilford, Conn. (1870–72), Bridgehampton, Long Island (1872), First Church, Taunton, Mass. (1872–73), East Pearl Street, New Haven, Conn. (1873–76), North Church, Hartford, Conn. (1876), Hazelville, Conn. (1877), Warren Street, Brooklyn (1877–80), St. Paul's, Fall River, Mass. (1880–81), First Church, Taunton, Mass. (1882–83), and Hazardville, Conn. (1884–86), while in 1887–88 he was presiding elder of the New Bedford district. From 1889 to 1893 he was president of Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis., and president of Maine Wesleyan Seminary and College from 1893 to 1897. He was then associate principal of Lasell Seminary, Auburndale, Mass., from 1897 to 1901, and since the latter year has been president of the Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Missionaries and Deaconesses of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C. He has written *God Revealed, or Nature's Best Word* (New York, 1899).

GALLANDI, gāl''lān''dî', **ANDREA:** Italian Oratorian and scholar; b. at Venice Dec. 7, 1709; d. there Jan. 12, 1779. He achieved fame by his edition of the *Bibliotheca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Græco-Latina* (14 vols., Venice, 1765–81). Despite the fact that he did not include works of the ancient theological authors which were already extant in separate editions, Gallandi's *Bibliotheca* is more complete, so far as minor works and authors are concerned, than any collection previous to that of Migne. He likewise edited a number of treatises *De vetustis canonum collectionibus* (1778), which included works by Coustant, Petrus de Marca, and the Ballerini brothers. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: *Nouvelle biographie générale*, xix. 291, Paris, 1858; G. A. Moschini, *Letteratura Veneziana*, iii. 138, 4 vols., Venice, 1806–08; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, iii. 98, Innsbruck, 1895.

GALLICAN CONFESSION (*Confessio Gallicana*, French Confession of Faith, Confession of La Rochelle): A confession adopted by the first national synod of the Reformed Church of France in 1559. During the first period of the Protestant congregations in France, there was no official symbol. There existed, however, the so-called *sommaires*, short statements of the principal truths of Holy Scripture which are found in Protestant Bibles, the two oldest being one in Latin in Robert Stephens' Bible (1532) and another in French in the Bible of Faber Stapulensis (1534). They are found also in Stephens' Latin New Testament (1552) and in the French New Testament of J. Gerard (1553) in a form revised and supplemented by Calvin. These original symbols of the French Protestant Church were prompted by apologetic reasons, being called for to refute the calumnies of Roman priests. Up to 1559 the Protestant congregations of France were independent, each being at liberty to set up its own confession, and the "summaries" were sufficient for all purposes.

The Earlier "Summaries."

The first impulse toward a general statement of the doctrine and discipline of all French Reformed congregations was given by a dispute over the doctrine of predestination which broke out in the congregation of Poitiers. As the preachers of that city could not settle the difficulties, the congregation of Paris was called to aid. The assembled preachers came to the conclusion that only a common symbol and a common church order could guard against the external and internal dangers of the Church, and it was resolved to convene a general assembly representative of the Reformed Church in France to provide what was needed. The congregation of Paris invited the other congregations to a national synod. Calvin disapproved of the doings of the Reformed congregations, and at his instigation the church council of Geneva sent three deputies to Paris, N. des Gallars, Arnauld, and Gilbert, with the draft of a confession in thirty-five articles and a personal letter from Calvin to François de Morel. In the mean time, the synod had begun its sessions on May 26, 1559, under the presidency of Morel. There were present probably about fourteen deputies, preachers or elders, but the number is variously given from eleven to seventy-two. During the first three days forty articles of church discipline were decided on. On May 28, the envoys from Geneva arrived. They submitted Calvin's draft and it was accepted with some slight changes.

Origin of the Confession. The Synod of 1559.

The arrangement is the same as in Calvin's "Institutes" and the Geneva catechism of 1540. The symbol contains forty articles and is divided into four parts, corresponding to the four chief dogmas—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church. The word of God, as revealed in Holy Scripture, is declared the only and infallible rule of faith. The Bible derives its authority from the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the believing soul. The chief dogmas are as in the *sommaires*—Adam's fall, original sin, total depravity of human nature, redemption through the blood of Christ, free grace of God, justification by faith. Predestination is taught with emphasis, but without supralapsarianism. In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper Calvin's conception of "being nourished from the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ" is retained.

Contents of the Confession.

The confession was unanimously accepted by the deputies and, according to Chandieu, was "read and proposed to the people and signed by all who could attend according to time and locality." Although it was intended to be kept secret, in the very same year it was published in Switzerland and in France, under the title *Confession de foy faicte d'un commun accord par les François qui désirent vivre selon la pureté de l'Évangile de NSJC* (I Peter iii.). It was then printed at the beginning of the French Bible, in place of the summary (cf. the Geneva Bible of 1559). A preface addressed to the king was added, and with this addition the confession was handed to him in 1561 by eight deputies from all provinces, chosen at

Later History of the Confession.

the second national synod in Poitiers (Mar. 10, 1561), with a petition from all congregations. The confession was finally laid before the whole world at the seventh national synod of La Rochelle (Apr. 2, 1571), which convened under the protection of a royal patent. All Reformed congregations of France were represented, and Theodore Beza had been called from Geneva to preside. There were also present Queen Jeanne d'Albret, Prince Henry of Navarre (the later Henry IV.), the Prince of Condé, Admiral Coligni, and many other noblemen. The confession was read and signed by all. During the time of the so-called "Churches of the Desert" (*églises du désert;* 1685–1787; see CAMISARDS; COURT, ANTOINE; HUGUENOTS; RABAUT, PAUL), the authority of the symbol began to wane until its subscription became optional. In 1848 unsuccessful attempts were made by H. Gasparin and F Monod to substitute a new confession. The deputies assembled at Paris rejected everything except Christ crucified as a basis of agreement. Another attempt in 1872 was more successful. A new rule of faith was declared in which the Reformed Church of France professed to remain true to the principles of faith upon which it was founded and to maintain the authority of Holy Scripture in agreement with the forefathers and martyrs of the Confession of La Rochelle. Since that time a gulf has existed between the orthodox and the liberal party in the Reformed Church of France.

(G. BONET-MAURY.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The French text with Eng. transl. is in Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. 356–382. The original text is in T. de Beza, *Hist. ecclésiastique des églises réformées*, ii. 173–190, Antwerp, 1580, and in *ZHT*, 1875, pp. 506–544, with introduction by Hoppe. An early Eng. transl. is in J. Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia reformata*, i., pp. vi.–xvi., London, 1692. Consult: Beza, *Hist.*, ut sup., 3 vols.; J. Quick, ut sup., 2 vols.; Calvin, *Opera*, Strasburg ed., ix. 57 sqq.; G. de Felice, *Hist. des Protestants en France*, Toulouse, 1851, Eng. transl., London, 1851; H. Lutteroth, *La Réformation en France*, Paris, 1859; F. Chaponnière, *La Question des confessions de foi au sein du protestantisme contemporain*, Geneva, 1867; H. Dieterlen, *Le Synode général de Paris en 1859*, Paris, 1873; E. Bersier, *Le Synode général de Paris en 1872*, ib. 1873; N. Weiss and O. Douen, in *Bulletin de la société d'hist. du protestantisme français*, pp. 37, 449, Paris, 1894; Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 490–498.

GALLICANISM.

Early Development of Nationalism (§ 1).
Formulation of the Gallican Principles (§ 2).
Relation of the Pope to the Episcopate (§ 3).
Relation of the Pope to the State (§ 4).

Gallicanism denotes the attitude, tending toward national independence, which was more or less widely prevalent in the Roman Catholic Church of France especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Church in Gaul was early recognized as a separate division; in the third century a papal vicar was commissioned to oversee its affairs, and by the fourth the bishop of Arles had succeeded in gaining a definite primacy and appeared as the representative of the pope (see ARLES, ARCHBISHOPRIC OF). Under the Merovingian kings the organization became more firmly established and enjoyed an increasing independence, always in close connection with the monarchy. After the king it was the largest landed proprietor, and the bishops and abbots were the most influential magnates of the kingdom. This connection involved the result that scarcely a single point of church life was excluded from royal regulation. The gradual development of the papal supremacy from Gregory VII. to Innocent III., aiming as it did at the liberation of the Church from all secular control, came into inevitable conflict with the system established in France and expressed in the *Codex Dionysio-Hadrianus* given by Adrian I. to Charlemagne. But while in Germany the Church was in the main successful in the conflict, the struggles of the popes with the French kings, such as that of Innocent III. with Philip Augustus and of Boniface VIII. with Philip the Fair, resulted in the strengthening of the royal power. The voluntary removal of censures and limitation of the bull *Clericis laicos* by Benedict XI. and the declaration of Clement V in 1306 that the bull *Unam sanctam* did not affect the rights of the king, completed the victory of the French conception of a State Church.

1. Early Development of Nationalism.

In 1594, under the title of *Les Libertés de l'église gallicane*, Pierre Pithou, a famous lawyer and humanist, for a long time procurator-general of Paris (d. 1596), put forth eighty-three propositions expressing the Gallican position on the status of the pope, the king, and the bishops, and on the internal government of the Church. A protest of the bishops against Pithou's work was suppressed by the parliament, and his book, supported later by Pierre Dupuy's anonymous collection of documents (1639) and commentary (1652), was reprinted with the royal license and became the standard in practise. Under Louis XIV the questions at issue became acute in the Régale (q.v.) controversy, and Gallicanism in its modern form was officially expressed by the famous *Declaratio cleri Gallicani* or "Four Articles of Gallicanism," drawn up by Bossuet, accepted by the episcopate on Mar. 19, 1682, and imposed upon the French clergy. The following is a translation of the "Four Articles":

2. Formulation of the Gallican Principles.

There are many who labor to subvert the Gallican decrees and liberties which our ancestors defended with so much zeal, and their foundations which rest upon the sacred canons and the tradition of the Fathers. Nor are there wanting those who, under the pretext of these liberties, seek to derogate from the primacy of St. Peter and of the Roman pontiffs his successors; from the obedience which all Christians owe to them, and from the majesty of the Apostolic See, in which the faith is taught and the unity of the faith is preserved. The heretics, on the other hand, omit nothing in order to represent that power by which the peace of the Church is maintained as intolerable both to kings and their subjects; and by such artifices estrange the souls of the simple from the communion of the Church, and therefore from Christ. With a view to remedy such evils, we, the archbishops and bishops assembled at Paris by the king's orders, representing together with the other deputies the Gallican Church, have judged it advisable, after mature deliberation, to determine and declare as follows:

1. St. Peter and his successors, vicars of Christ, and likewise the Church itself, have received from God power in things spiritual and pertaining to salvation, but not in things temporal and civil; inasmuch as the Lord says, My kingdom is not of this world; and again, Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's. The Apostolic precept also holds, Let every soul be subject

unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God; whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. Consequently kings and princes are not by the law of God subject to any ecclesiastical power, nor to the keys of the Church, with respect to their temporal government. Their subjects can not be released from the duty of obeying them, nor absolved from the oath of allegiance; and this maxim, necessary to public tranquillity, and not less advantageous to the Church than to the State, is to be strictly maintained, as conformable to the word of God, the tradition of the Fathers, and the example of the Saints.

2. The plenitude of power in things spiritual, which resides in the Apostolic See and the successors of St. Peter, is such that at the same time the decrees of the ecumenical Council of Constance, in its fourth and fifth sessions, approved as they are by the Holy See and the practise of the whole Church, remain in full force and perpetual obligation; and the Gallican Church does not approve the opinion of those who would depreciate the said decrees as being of doubtful authority, insufficiently approved, or restricted in their application to a time of schism.

3. Hence the exercise of the Apostolic authority must be regulated by the canons enacted by the Spirit of God and consecrated by the reverence of the whole world. The ancient rules, customs, and institutions received by the realm and Church of France remain likewise inviolable; and it is for the honor and glory of the Apostolic See that such enactments, confirmed by the consent of the said see and of the churches, should be observed without deviation.

4. The pope has the principal place in deciding questions of faith, and his decrees extend to every church and all churches; but nevertheless his judgment is not irreversible until confirmed by the consent of the Church.

3. Relation of the Pope to the Episcopate.

Under the system thus formally established, the pope was recognized as the successor of Peter and vicar of Christ, the divinely appointed head of the Church, with spiritual jurisdiction over the whole body and over national Churches in particular. But the status of the bishops rested equally upon divine ordinance, and they, with the pope, represented the Church in general councils, which were of higher authority than the pope, and could alone issue an irreformable definition in matters of faith; a definition issued by the pope when no council was sitting required the consent of the whole Church before it could be considered irreformable. From the point of view of his relations to the French episcopate, the pope was supposed to be bound by the canons, and in France especially by the recognized ancient customs. These, it is true, had been substantially altered by the Concordat of 1516 between Francis I. and Leo X., which had gone into effect in spite of clerical protests (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, III., 2, § 1). The king named the bishops, who were then confirmed by the pope. Papal interference in the affairs of individual dioceses was only to be tolerated as far as the law of the Church allowed. The papal nuncio had no jurisdiction in France, and the presence of a legate *a latere* was permissible only in virtue of a mutual agreement, and then only during the king's pleasure. The greatest power was conceded to the pope in regard to the appointment to benefices; abbots and, in practise, abbesses were nominated by the king and confirmed by the pope, who also claimed for his province dispensations of all kinds, unless the king or the parliaments interfered in a specific case.

4. Relation of the Pope to the State.

In theory the Church was an independent power, but in reality the State ruled. Every papal constitution, whether relating to doctrine or discipline, required the approval of the king or a government official before it went into effect in France, and the same thing applied to the decrees of councils. A part of the decisions of the Council of Trent was enforced through the royal *ordonnance de Blois* of 1579. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was strictly limited. The offenses of clerics, unless purely ecclesiastical, came before secular tribunals, except in the case of bishops, who were tried before a provincial council. All mixed causes (dissolution of marriage, questions of church property, benefices, tithes, etc.) were decided by the higher secular courts. The king claimed the right to tax the clergy and church property, but this was vehemently opposed by the clergy and never wholly conceded before the Revolution. The incomes of vacant sees went to the king, who also claimed the right to appoint to all benefices during a vacancy in the see.

The State took strong ground against any immediate interference of the curia in the government of the French Church. A French prelate consecrated in Rome was not allowed to exercise his functions. The decrees of the Roman congregations had no validity in France, nor were Frenchmen allowed to be summoned to Rome in any process of law. As a consequence of this conflict between the rival powers, an institution grew up which seriously crippled the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the *appel comme d'abus*, by which, on the application of one party to a case, or simply on grounds of public interests, the *procureur-général* might cite the case before the parliament of the province for investigation and decision. This institution, created by the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438 (see Pragmatic Sanction), was abolished by the Concordat of 1516, but the parliaments still maintained it; it found a new support in the *ordonnance de Villers-Coterets* in 1539, was limited or modified on complaint of the clergy by new edicts in 1571, 1580, 1605, and 1695, and stoutly upheld by the parliaments until practically there was no more question of an independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction or administration. Thus the power of the papacy was indeed broken, but at the cost of serious damage to the rights of the episcopate and the complete subjection of the Gallican Church to the State. The downfall of the old régime, however, allowed the pope to acquire a degree of power in France which he had never before possessed, and the nineteenth century witnessed the gradual decay of the last remnants of the old Gallican spirit. (J. F. von Schulte.)

Bibliography: P. de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, Paris, 1641; J. B. Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis . . . de potestate ecclesiæ sanxit clerus Gallicanus*, Luxemburg, 1730; C. Fleury, *Discours sur les libertés de l'église gallicane*, Paris, 1765; idem, *Institution au droit ecclésiastique*, ib. 1767; L. E. Dupin, *Les Libertés de l'église gallicane*, ib. 1824; idem, *Manuel du droit publique ecclésiastique français*, ib. 1847; J. B. Bordas-Demoulin, *Les Pouvoirs constitutifs de l'église*, ib. 1855; F. Huet, *Le Gallicanisme*, ib. 1855; W. H. Jervis, *The Gallican Church*, London, 1872 (from 1516 to the Revolution); idem, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution*, ib. 1882; A. Le Roy, *Le Gallicanisme au xviii. siècle*, Paris, 1892; L. Mention, *Documents relatifs aux rapports du clergé avec la royauté 1682–1705*, Paris, 1893 sqq.; A. Debedour, *Hist. des rap-*

ports de l'église et de l'état 1789–1870, ib. 1898; Keller, *La Fin du gallicanisme et M. Maret son dernier représentant*, Alençon, 1901; A. Galton, *Church and State in France, 1300–1907*, London, 1907; *Cambridge Modern History*, v. 72 sqq., New York, 1908. Documents pertinent to the subject, including the bulls *Clericis laicos* and *Unam sanctam*, are in Thatcher and McNeal, *Documents*, pp. 311–314; Robinson, *European History*, pp. 346 sqq., 488 sqq.; and Reich, *Documents*, pp. 193–195, 379–386.

GALLIENUS, gal''i-ê'nus, **PUBLIUS LICINIUS:** Roman emperor 260–268; b. 218 or 219; d. at Milan Mar. 4, 268. In 254 he was made coregent by his father, the Emperor Valerian, and ruled with him until 260, when the elder emperor was taken prisoner by the Persians. Gallienus thenceforth seems to have remained sole ruler, for it is not certain that his stepbrother, the younger Valerian, ever became Augustus. On the revolt of Aureolus in Illyria, Gallienus marched against him and laid siege to Milan, but fell a victim to a conspiracy of his officers, headed by Aurelian and Heraclian. His reign was marked by inroads of the barbarians from the north and east, and by ceaseless insurrections and attempts at usurpation. Notwithstanding that he was unequal to the tasks which confronted him, Gallienus was highly lauded by his elder contemporary Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, who, writing to Hermammon in 262 (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 23), compared the emperor to the sun which shines again after its temporary obscurity by a cloud (alluding to the usurper Macrianus, who had taken possession of Egypt), and even saw in him the fulfilment of the prophecy in Isa. xliii. 19.

The ground of this favorable judgment of Dionysius, in which Eusebius concurs, is evidently the repeal by the new emperor of the harsh edicts of Valerian against the Christians. It has even been stated (without cogent evidence) that he declared Christianity to be a tolerated religion. The edict issued by Gallienus in 260 is lost, and the one translated from the Latin by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., xiii. 2) is a special edict for Egypt, promulgated in 261. Granting that the edict for the entire empire was analogous to this Egyptian decree, it merely provided that the bishops should not be sought out by the authorities, and that the places of worship should be left unmolested. It therefore simply restored the conditions which existed before the reigns of Decius and Valerian, without giving Christianity the slightest official recognition. The fact that the decree was addressed directly to the bishops was indeed unprecedented, but this was clearly due to the importance and influence which they had attained. Eusebius himself, moreover, merely states that Gallienus alleviated the position of the Christians, but nowhere says that he tolerated them, while the mass of Christian tradition has either ignored the edict or paid scant attention to it. The clearest evidence that the attitude of the State toward Christianity was unchanged lies in the fact that Christian soldiers could still suffer martyrdom for their faith (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 15). The most that can be said is that the repeal of the edicts of Valerian practically amounted to a declaration of toleration for the Church in view of the position which it then occupied. Despairing of the possibility of crushing Christianity by persecution, Gallienus determined to leave it alone, though without changing its legal status. Nevertheless, it is clear, from the executions during his reign and the rule of his successors, that the State still claimed the right to inflict capital punishment for refusal to worship the images of the emperor or even for the avowal of a belief in Christianity.

(Adolf Harnack.)

Bibliography: The sources are: Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, xii.; Trebellius Pollio, *Gallieni duo;* idem, *Claudius*, i. 4; Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv. 1 sqq., Eng. transl. in Bohn's *Classical Library*, London, 1887; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VII., x. 1, xi. 8, xiii. 1–2, etc.; Georgius Syncellus, *Chronographia*, i. 717, Bonn, 1829. Consult: L. S. Le Nain de Tillemont, *Hist. des empereurs*, pp. 288–289, Dresden, 1754; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chaps. x., xvi.; Brequigny, in *Mémoires de l'académie des inscriptions*, xxx. 349–350, xxxii. 266–267; Neander, *Christian Church*, i., passim, ii. 15, 167; and the literature under Persecutions, Christian, in the Roman Empire.

GALLIO. See Greece, I., § 1.

GALLITZIN, DEMETRIUS AUGUSTINE: Roman Catholic missionary; b. at The Hague Dec. 22, 1770; d. at Loretto, Cambria County, Pa., May 6, 1840. His mother was a famous adherent of Pietism, Adelheid Amalie von Schmettau, wife of the Russian Prince Dmitri Alexeievitch Galitzin (see Overberg, Bernhard Heinrich; the name is variously spelled: Gallitzin, Golitzine, Golizyn, preferably Galitzin or Galizin; that of the subject of this sketch, however, almost invariably appears in the form Gallitzin). After serving in the Austrian army in the first campaign against France, he sailed for America with Father Brosius, his tutor, in 1792. He joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1787, surrendered his commission in the Russian army, entered the seminary of St. Sulpice in Baltimore, and was ordained priest Mar. 18, 1795, being the second priest ordained in this country. After serving for a time in the missions of Port Tobacco, Md., and Conewago, Pa., in 1799 he became pastor of the Roman Catholics of Maguire's Settlement in the wildest part of the Alleghany Mountains, now Cambria County, Pa. Here he bought more than 20,000 acres of land and began to furnish homes to settlers on easy terms. On his own property he founded in 1803 the town of Loretto. Other settlements were made at Ebensburg, Carrolltown, St. Augustine, Wilmore, and Summitville. As "Father Smith," by which name he had been naturalized in 1802, Gallitzin became famous for his charity, self-sacrifice, and zeal in Christian work. In 1809 he was allowed by special act of the legislature to resume his family name. He was held in high esteem by all sects, and high episcopal honors were frequently urged upon him. His writings are still prized by Roman Catholics, particularly his *Defence of Catholic Principles* (Pittsburg, 1816); *Letters to a Protestant Friend on the Scriptures* (1818); *Appeal to the Protestant Public* (1818); and *Six Letters of Advice* (1834).

Bibliography: T. Heyden, *Memoir on the Life and Character of P. D. A. de Gallitzin*, Baltimore, 1869; S. M. Brownson, *Life of Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, Prince and Priest*, New York, 1873; Pauline Hügel, *A Royal Son and Mother*, Notre Dame, Ind., 1903.

GALLOWAY, CHARLES BETTS: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Kosciusko, Miss., Sept. 1, 1849; d. at Jackson, Miss., May 12, 1909. He studied at the University of Mississippi (B.A., 1868) and held pastorates at Port Gibson (1871), Yazoo City (1872–73), Jackson (1874–78), and Vicksburg, Miss. (1878–84). From 1882 to 1886 he was editor of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, and in 1886 was elected bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He was a fraternal messenger to the Methodist Church of Canada in 1886 and to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England in 1892, while in 1901 he preached the opening sermon of the Ecumenical Conference at London. He was also a member of the Ecumenical Conference at Washington in 1891, and visited the Methodist Episcopal missions in China, Japan, Korea, and those in Brazil and Mexico. He was president of the board of education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. In theology he was an orthodox member of his denomination. He wrote *Methodism, Its Providential Origin and Progress* (Nashville, Tenn., 1880); *Life of Bishop Linus Parker* (1886); *Hand-Book of Prohibition* (1886); *A Circuit of the Globe* (1895); *Modern Missions, their Evidential Value* (Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University; 1896); *Christianity and the Nation* (Quillian lectures at Emory College; 1898); *The South and the Negro* (1904); *Methodism's To-morrow* (1904); and *Bishop John Christian Keener* (1906).

GALLUS, CAIUS VIBIUS TREBONIANUS: Roman emperor 251–253; b. at Perusia (the modern Perugia, 85 m. n. of Rome), probably in 207; d. at Forum Flaminii (probably the modern San Giovanni pro Fiammo, 2 m. n. of Foligno) or at Interamna (the modern Terni, 59 m. s. e. of Perugia) late in the summer of 253. He was a general of Decius in the war against the Goths, and after the death of this emperor was declared Augustus by the Senate in 251, together with Hostilianus, the son of Decius. Hostilianus died in the following year, and Volusianus, the son of Gallus, was appointed his successor. The reign was one of disaster, marked by a shameful peace with the Goths and their renewed inroads, the loss of Syria and Armenia to the Persians, and a terrible pestilence. On the Danube the Pannonian legions proclaimed Æmilianus emperor, whereupon Gallus and his son marched against him, only to fall at the hands of their mutinous troops on the way. In the early portion of the reign of Gallus the Christians had a brief respite from the horrors of the persecution of Decius, but before long the new emperor reenforced measures of repression, either at his own initiative or under the compulsion of the people, who were maddened by pestilence and poverty. As early as May, 252, it was feared at Carthage that the new laws would be enforced, and in the summer of the following year Cyprian wrote to the Roman bishop Cornelius of an imperial edict by which "the people were commanded to offer sacrifices." The actual persecutions, however, seem to have been mild, banishment being the penalty rather than death, so that all recollection of a persecution during the reign of Gallus soon vanished from the Church.

(ADOLF HARNACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: J. C. Orelli, *Inscriptionum Latinarum . Collectio*, nos. 281, 997, 998, 1000, 3 vols., Zurich, 1828, 1856; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, VII. i., x. 1; idem, *Chronicon*, 2269–72; Jerome, *Chronicon*, 2268–2270. Consult: L. S. Le Nain de Tillemont, *Hist. des empereurs*, x. 245–246, Dresden, 1754; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, i. 250–252; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 85; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 136, 258, 711; and the literature under PERSECUTIONS, CHRISTIAN, IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE, and CYPRIAN.

GALLUS (HAHN), NICOLAUS: Leader of the Reformation in Regensburg; b. at Köthen (19 m. n. of Halle), Anhalt, 1516; d. at Zellerbad, near Liebenzell (20 m. w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, June, 1570. At Wittenberg, where he became a student in 1530 and received the master's degree in 1537, he won the commendation of Melanchthon. In 1543 Luther sent Hieronymus Nopus as preacher to Regensburg at the request of the city council and with him went Gallus, who was ordained by Bugenhagen in April. In 1548 trouble arose in Regensburg over the acceptance of the Interim. Gallus wrote a treatise against it, and had to leave the city; services in the only Evangelical church there were discontinued. For a time Gallus preached for Cruciger (who was ill) at Wittenberg, then in 1549, through the influence of his brother-in-law, Heinrich Merkel, city secretary at Magdeburg, he went to the Ulrich Church in that city. He joined Flacius in opposition to the adiaphorism of the Wittenberg circle and published a *Disputation von Mitteldingen* in 1550. He remained in Magdeburg after its capitulation in 1551, and kept up the dispute against Osiander and Major. In June, 1553, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt called him to his native city to assist in the settlement of the administration of the church property. In August, 1553, Gallus was called back to Regensburg as leader of the Evangelical cause. He worked there for almost seventeen years, and the effects of his activity were felt far beyond the borders of the town. In the disputes of the following years he fought faithfully on the side of Flacius. Like him he tried to influence Melanchthon by letters, but the latter treated Gallus rather haughtily. It probably angered him that Gallus had republished (1554) his *Sententiæ veterum de cœna Domini*, which was directed against Œcolampadius. In 1561 Gallus warned the princes convened at Naumburg of the spreading Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He also got into a dispute with Brenz, whom he suspected of leanings toward Melanchthonism. From 1562 to 1566 he furnished a refuge to Flacius, who had been expelled from Jena. Melanchthon reproached Gallus for fighting continually against the Evangelicals, instead of combating Romanism. But the reproach was not pertinent; during the diet in 1556 he preached against the Roman Catholics, and there are still extant manuscripts containing theses of disputation against the Ingolstadt Catholics. In this connection may be mentioned Gallus' writing directed against Corpus Christi day: *Vom abgöttischen Fest, Frohnleichnams-Tag genannt* (1561). His congregation esteemed him highly for his zeal

in the maintenance of pure doctrine and moral discipline, and his personal life was blameless.

(G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources: Some of his letters are printed in *CR*, viii., ix., and in J. Fecht, *Hist. eccl. sæculi xvi.*, supplement vol., pp. 27 sqq.; part of his writings are in W Preger, *M. Flacius*, ii. 540 sqq., Erlangen, 1861 (where other biographical material is found). Consult: L. Widmann, in *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, xv. 187 sqq.; W Germann, *J. Forster*, pp. 371 sqq., Meiningen, 1894; E. Böhl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Reformation in Oesterreich*, Jena, 1902; *ADB*, viii. 351 sqq.

GAMALIEL ("God is my rewarder"): A celebrated rabbi of the first century. There were at least two noted leaders of this name, the one mentioned Acts v. 34 being generally called the Elder or Gamaliel I. to distinguish him from his grandson. According to Acts xxii. 3 he was the teacher of Paul. In Jewish literature he is known as the ancestor of the later Jewish patriarchs (ethnarchs) of Palestine. The family claimed descent from Benjamin and even from David. That Hillel the Great was Gamaliel's grandfather is claimed, but is not certain. Jewish tradition speaks of Gamaliel as president of the Sanhedrin, but these statements refer generally to Gamaliel II. A few practical enactments are ascribed to him. Thus he decided (Mishnah, *Gittin* iv. 2) that in the letter of divorce the formula "and every name which he (she) has" be added to the name of the husband and the wife, thus precluding the possibility of invalidating a letter of divorce in case one had different names. In the interest of orphans he introduced the custom that the widow state under oath that she had thus far received nothing, before taking her dowry from the estate (*Gittin* iv. 6). He considered the evidence of one witness of the death of a husband as sufficient to allow the widow to marry again (*Yebamot* xvi. 7). That he became a Christian as the *Clementine Recognitions* (i. 65) state is an invention. He died probably before the year 70, for his son Simeon played an important part during the rebellion, whereas Gamaliel is mentioned no more.

(G. DALMAN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. D. Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, ii. 60–61, Edinburgh, 1864 (gives rabbinical references); J. Derenbourg, *L'Hist. et la géographie de la Palestine*, i. 239–246, Paris, 1867; H. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. 373 sqq., Leipsic, 1878; F. W Farrar, *Paul*, vol. i., excursus v., London, 1879; J. Hamburger, *Real-Encyklopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 236–237, Strelitz, 1883; M. Bloch, *Institutionen des Judentums*, II., i. 118–202, Brünn, 1884; M. Braunschweiger, *Die Lehrer der Mischnah*, pp. 50 sqq., Frankfort, 1890; Schürer, *Geschichte* and Eng. transl., consult Indexes; *DB*, ii. 106; *EB*, ii. 1638–39; *JE*, v. 558–560.

GAMES: A means of securing entertainment and relaxation, as is indicated by the most general Hebrew term "to play," *ẓiḥḥak* (= "to laugh long and heartily"). The Old Testament gives no detailed information about the games of children, but it may be assumed that Hebrew young people employed their mental, muscular, and nervous energy in the same way as the children of all other peoples. Even the positive prohibition of images by Islam has not prevented the children from delighting in models of horses, sheep, and the like. Since in spite of Ex. xx. 4 there were varied products of the arts in animal and other forms in the Temple, the Hebrew children doubtless had their playthings made after similar models. A hint of a mode of entertainment may be given in Job xli. 5—"Wilt thou play with him [leviathan] as with a bird? or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?" (cf. Baruch iii. 17). The excavations in Taanach have revealed bone implements such as the Arabs still employ in playing dice. The Talmud (*Rosh ha-Shanah* i. 8) pronounces those who train doves for speed trials or to lure other doves into their dove-cotes and those who use dice incompetent to bear witness. There is mention of a game of drafts in *Sanhedrin* 25b. Early rabbis condemned card-playing. To win money from a Jew by a game is robbery, to win it from a Gentile is not robbery though a breach of the law. "Odd and even" was a game of the Egyptians; Assyrian dice of bronze with spots of gold have been found; a similar game, played by the drawing of arrows, was used by the ancient Arabs; the Homeric Greeks had both drafts and dice; and Tacitus reports that the Germans played with dice. Doubtless the early Hebrews in their moments of leisure, as they sat at their doors or met in public gathering-places (Gen. xix. 1; Lam. v. 14) or on festal occasions (Judges xiv. 10 sqq.), amused themselves in similar manner, and it is known that they sharpened their wits in the propounding and answering of riddles (Judges xiv. 14 sqq.; I Kings x. 1; Prov. xxx. 21 sqq.). The drama does not seem to have been congenial to the Hebrew character, and for this reason the interpretation of Canticles as a drama seems less reasonable, though in later times the Jews are reported to have gone upon the stage and written dramas (Josephus, *Life*, iii.; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, i. 155).

There were also what may be classed as sensuous games in distinction from those already mentioned which exercise primarily the mental faculties. In these song and music occupy prominent parts (Ex. xv. 20–21; I Sam. xvi. 16 sqq.; Isa. v. 12; Jer. xxx. 19; Amos vi. 5; see MUSIC, HEBREW). Games which exercised the powers of body and will were numerous; among these dances take first place (Job xxi. 11; Jer. xxxi. 4), in which the course of the seasons or national success or personal prowess was celebrated in joyous and concerted movement (Judges xxi. 21; I Sam. xviii. 6; see DANCING). With such dancing to the accompaniment of music and song Samson was probably expected to entertain his enemies (Judges xvi. 25). The foot-race is implied in Ps. xix. 5, and by the references to the speed of Saul, Jonathan, and Asahel (II Sam. i. 23, ii. 18). Skill of hand and arm were employed in a game of ball (Isa. xxii. 18), which game is recognized among Assyrian sports, is mentioned by the rabbis, and was known to the Egyptians. The shooting of arrows at a mark was likewise a means of entertainment (I Sam. xx. 20; Job xvi. 12; Lam. iii. 12). Throwing the stone is suggested by Zech. xii. 3 (cf. C. von Orelli, *Durchs heilige Land*, Basel, 1890, p. 291). The Jews raised energetic protest against the adoption of Greek sports (I Macc. i. 14; II Macc. iv. 9–15); but the Herodian faction had theaters and amphitheaters near Jerusalem and Joppa, and Herod's interest in such matters is reported by Josephus (*Ant.* XV., viii. 1, ix. 6, XVI., v.

1). Gladiatorial shows were most strongly condemned by the Jews. In the New Testament Paul makes frequent reference to the foot-race and its rewards (I Cor. ix. 24–27; Phil. iii. 12; II Tim. ii. 5; cf. James i. 12; Rev. ii. 10). (E. KÖNIG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. J. Van Lennep, *Bible Lands, . . Customs and Manners Illustrative of Scripture*, pp. 573–574, New York, 1875; J. G. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, London, 1878; E. Buchholz, *Die homerischen Realien*, ii. 1, pp. 280–299, Leipsic, 1881; J. S. Howson, *Metaphors of St. Paul*, chap. iv., London, 1883; A. Huber, *Ueber das "Meisir" Spiel der heidnischen Araber*, pp. 9 sqq., Leipsic, 1883; A. Wünsche, *Die Rätselweisheit bei den Hebräern*, ib. 1883; M. Lazarus, *Die Reize des Spieles*, Berlin, 1883; T. Mommsen, *Römische Altertümer*, ii. 517 sqq., Leipsic, 1887; G. Dalman, *Palästinischer Diwan*, 1901, pp. 95 sqq., 182 sqq., 254 sqq.; *DB*, ii. 106–108.

GAMS, gāms, PIUS BONIFATIUS: German Roman Catholic; b. at Mittelbuch (a village of Württemberg) Jan. 23, 1816; d. at Munich May 11, 1892. He studied at Tübingen, and became vicar at Achstettin and Gmünd in 1838 and teacher at Horb in 1841. He made a scientific journey at the expense of the State in 1842–43, and in the following year was appointed acting pastor at Wurmlingen and professor at Rottweil. After serving as teacher at Gmünd, he became professor of theology and philosophy at the episcopal seminary of Hildesheim in 1847, but in 1855 entered the Benedictine monastery of St. Boniface at Munich. Gams was a prolific writer, his principal works being: *Ausgang und Ziel der Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1850); *Die Geschichte der Kirche Jesu Christi im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (3 vols., Innsbruck, 1854–58; supplementary volume, 1860); *Margott, die Siege der Kirche im ersten Jahrzehnt des Pontifikats Pius IX.* (1860); *Katechetische Reden gehalten in der Basilika zu München* (2 vols., Regensburg, 1862); *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* (3 vols., 1862–79); *Das Jahr des Martyrtodes der heiligen Apostel Petrus und Paulus* (1867); *Zur Geschichte der spanischen Staatsinquisition* (1878); and *Der Bonifaciusverein in Deutschland 1850–1880* (Paderborn, 1880). He wrote also a biography of J. A. Möhler (Regensburg, 1866) and edited his *Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols., 1867–68), as well as the *Series episcoporum ecclesiæ catholicæ quotquot innotuerunt a beato Petro apostolo* (1872; supplements 1879 and 1886).

GANGRA, SYNOD OF (circa 340). See EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE.

GANNON, THOMAS JOSEPH: Roman Catholic; b. at Cambridge, Mass., July 14, 1853. He studied at Boston College, which he left in 1872 to enter the Society of Jesus. He studied the usual courses of the Society at Frederic, Md. (1872–75, 1889–90), and Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. (1875–78, 1883–87), and was professor of Latin, Greek, and mathematics at Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., 1878–83. He taught philosophy at Boston College (1887–88) and at Woodstock College (1888–89), and after being assistant to his provincial in 1890–91 was president of St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y., until 1896. He was then again assistant to two provincials for five years; in 1901–06 provincial of the Maryland-New York province, and in 1907 became instructor of tertiaries in the Novitiate of St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. He has been a member of the Missionary Band since 1906.

GARASSE, gā″rās′, FRANÇOIS: French Jesuit; b. at Angoulême (66 m. n.e. of Bordeaux), France, 1584; d. at Poitiers (60 m. s.s.w. of Tours), France, June 14, 1631. He joined the Jesuit order in 1600, and soon became known as a powerful pulpit orator. As a writer he devoted himself chiefly to polemics, sparing no opponents of his order, and attacking even the dead. In 1622 he published a pamphlet against Étienne Pasquier, a Roman Catholic, who had died several years before, because the latter had defended the university against the Jesuits in 1565. Under the pseudonym "Andreas Schioppius" he wrote a polemical pamphlet entitled *Elixir calvinisticum* (Charenton, 1615) aimed at the French Reformed Protestants, and in 1619 he published at Brussels his *Rabelais réformé*, which was more of a satire than a polemic. He was especially antagonistic toward Pierre du Moulin, a prominent and scholarly Reformed polemic author. Garasse's writings are characterized by a lack of earnestness, scientific spirit, and thorough knowledge of his subject, as well as by a want of dignity and truthfulness. He died of the plague at Poitiers, whither he had been sent at his own request to care for the sick.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, i. 289, Innsbruck, 1892; De Backer, *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus*, ed. C. Sommervogel, iii. 1184 sqq., Paris, 1892.

GARDENS, HEBREW: In gardening the Israelites were pupils of the Canaanites. The Hebrew *gan* meant either a vegetable-garden (I Kings xxi. 2) or an orchard (Jer. xxix. 5; Amos iv. 9; Eccles. ii. 5). In the first-mentioned were raised onions, garlic, cucumbers, and melons (which, eaten with bread, were leading articles of diet), and aromatic herbs, such as mint and caraway. Such gardens required careful and bountiful watering (Isa. lviii. 11; Jer. xxxi. 12). Vegetables were often planted in the fields after the harvest of the winter crop (see AGRICULTURE, HEBREW).

Of greater importance were the orchards (see FRUIT-TREES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT), which formed the gardens characteristic of the Old Testament. The kings of Jerusalem had such gardens in the valley southeast of the city (II Kings xxv. 4; Jer. xxxix. 4; cf. II Kings xxi. 18, 26), which served as pleasure-grounds, particularly when provided with water. To "sit under one's vine and fig-tree" was characteristic of a happy period (I Kings iv. 25; Micah iv. 4). The old Hebrew, like other dwellers in the scantily watered East (cf. the descriptions of paradise, in the Koran and the general Mohammedan conception), thought of paradise as an Eden with trees of all kinds, where, at evening, cool breezes blow (Gen. iii. 8). It was customary to place the family vault in a "garden" (II Kings xxi. 18, 26; Matt. xxvii. 60). In Babylon such pleasure-grounds were popular (cf. B. Meissner and P. Rost, *Bauinschriften Sanheribs*, v. 14 sqq., Leipsic, 1893), and the kings and noblemen of Persia delighted in beautiful parks (Xenophon, *Cyropædia*, I., iii. 12; *Anabasis*, I., ii. 71; cf. Esther i. 5, vii. 7). Indeed, the word *pardes*, the later

Hebrew designation for such a garden, meaning "paradise" and also "forest" (Neh. ii. 8), was borrowed from the Persian. I. BENZINGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp 35–36; E. Day, *Social Life among the Hebrews*, New York, 1901; *DB*, ii 108–110; *EB*, ii. 1640–44 (both of these are especially excellent); *JE*, vi. 470–472.

GARDINER, FREDERIC: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Gardiner, Me., Sept. 11, 1822; d. at Middletown, Conn., July 18, 1899. He studied at Hobart College, Bowdoin College (B.A., 1842), and the General Theological Seminary, New York City, from which he was graduated in 1845. Ordered deacon in 1845, he was advanced to the priesthood in 1846. He was minister and rector of Trinity Church, Saco, Me., 1845–47, curate at St. Luke's, Philadelphia, 1848, and rector of Christ Church, Bath, Me., 1848–54. He spent the years 1854–56 in Europe, then became rector of Trinity Church, Lewiston, Me., for a year. From 1857 to 1865 he was in charge of his father's estate at Gardiner, and at the same time rector of St. Matthew's, Hallowell, Me., besides assisting Bishop George Burgess in his tentative theological school at Gardiner. In 1865 he accepted a call to the professorship of the literature and interpretation of the New Testament at the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary at Gambier, O., but resigned two years later, and after being a general missionary in the diocese of Massachusetts for a year, was assistant rector of Trinity Church, Middletown, Conn., 1867–68. From 1869 to 1882 he was professor of Old Testament and Christian evidences in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., and from the latter year until his death was professor of the literature and interpretation of the New Testament in the same institution, also serving as librarian throughout this period. He wrote *The Island of Life, an Allegory* (Boston, 1851); *Commentary on the Epistle of St. Jude* (1856); *Harmony of the Gospels in Greek* (Andover, 1871); *Harmony of the Gospels in English* (1871); *Diatessaron, The Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Gospels* (1871); *The Principles of Textual Criticism* (1876); *The Old and New Testaments in their Mutual Relations* (New York, 1885); *Was the Religion of Israel a Revelation or merely a Development?* (1889); and the posthumous *Aids to Scripture Study* (1890). He wrote also the commentary on Leviticus for the American edition of Lange's commentary (New York, 1876), and on II Samuel and Ezekiel for Bishop C. J. Ellicott's *Old Testament Commentary for English Readers* (London, 1883–84), besides editing Chrysostom's "Homilies on Hebrews" for *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Library of the Fathers*, xiv. (New York, 1890).

GARDINER, JAMES: A colonel of Scottish dragoons famous for his remarkable religious experience; b. at Carriden (17 m. w. of Edinburgh), Linlithgowshire, Jan. 11, 1688; killed at the battle of Prestonpans Sept. 21, 1745. At fourteen he became an ensign in a Scottish regiment in the service of Holland. In 1702 he exchanged to the English army and distinguished himself in the campaigns of Marlborough. Until July, 1719, he led a career of notorious licentiousness. Then while waiting for an appointment with a dissolute woman, he picked up a Christian book (Watson's *Christian Soldier* according to Doddridge; Gurnall's *Christian Armour* according to Carlyle); suddenly a blaze of light illuminated the paper, and, looking up, Gardiner saw what he took for a vision of Christ on the cross and thought he heard him speak. He now forsook his old ways, and thereafter led an exemplary Christian life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Doddridge, *Some Remarkable Passages in the Life of . . Col. J. Gardiner*, London, 1747 (very often reprinted, e.g., Edinburgh, 1848); idem, *Sermon on the Death of Col. Gardiner*, ib. 1747; *DNB*, xx. 414–416.

GARDINER, STEPHEN: Bishop of Winchester and Lord Chancellor of England; b. at Bury St. Edmunds (60 m. n.e. of London), Suffolk, between 1483 and 1490; d. at Whitehall, London, Nov. 12, 1555. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he later became fellow (Doctor of Civil Law, 1520; Doctor of Canon Law, 1521), and in 1524 was made a lecturer in the university, shortly before his appointment as tutor to a son of the Duke of Norfolk. He now became secretary to Wolsey, and from 1525 to 1549 was master of Trinity Hall. He visited France with Wolsey in 1527, and in 1528 he and Edward Fox were sent as ambassadors to the pope in the interests of the divorce from Catherine of Aragon desired by the king. It was Gardiner's tact and determination which induced Clement VIII. to assent to a commission to try the case in England. Gardiner was made archdeacon of Norfolk on Mar. 1, 1529, and early in the following year again went to Italy in an unsuccessful endeavor to secure the king's divorce. He was appointed secretary to the king, and in Feb., 1530, visited Cambridge in a vain effort to induce the university to decide in favor of the divorce. In 1531 he was collated to the archdeaconry of Leicester, and on Nov. 27, 1531, he was consecrated bishop of Winchester. From December to March he was once more in France as an ambassador, in Apr., 1532, he was appointed custodian of John Fisher (q.v.), and in May was one of the assessors of the court which annulled Henry's marriage to Catherine, while at the coronation of Anne Boleyn on June 8 he and the bishop of London bore her train. He was again in France on business connected with the divorce in September, but his resistance to Henry's claim of spiritual supremacy led him to resign his secretaryship and retire to his diocese. He was soon summoned to court, but on Feb. 10, 1535, formally renounced the jurisdiction of the pope and published his *De vera obedientia* (London, 1535). Thus regaining the favor of the king, Gardiner was again appointed ambassador to France, and during this time dissuaded Henry from making a league with the Continental Protestants. The suspicions entertained concerning him, however, caused him to be superseded as ambassador at Paris by Bonner, but in the following year he was sent as ambassador to Germany.

With the downfall of his rival Cromwell in 1540, Gardiner became supreme, and was even elected chancellor of Cambridge as successor to Cromwell. In 1541 he was once more in Germany as royal

ambassador, and in 1542 he was one of those who conducted the negotiations with the imperial ambassador in London. He enjoyed the favor of Henry to the last, but with the accession of Edward VI. he was removed from the Council of State and from the chancellorship of the university. In consequence of his opposition to the religious innovations of the new council, Gardiner was committed to the Fleet on Sept. 25, 1547, but was allowed to return to his diocese the following December. Summoned to London in May, 1548, he still refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the council and maintained the doctrine of the real presence, for which he was imprisoned in the Tower for a year. In Dec., 1550, he was tried before Cranmer, and on Feb. 15, 1551, was deprived of his bishopric and confined to the Tower until the death of Edward in 1553.

With the accession of Mary, Gardiner was released and restored to office. As lord high chancellor he crowned the queen Oct. 1, 1553, and presided at the opening of Parliament four days later, in addition to being reelected chancellor of Cambridge and master of Trinity Hall. He advocated rigorous measures against those who refused obedience to the Roman Catholic Church, but the severity popularly ascribed to him is doubtless exaggerated. He also strove to restore England to the papal allegiance, and even sought to have Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon declared valid, thus implying the illegitimacy of Elizabeth. He was likewise obliged to work in favor of Mary's marriage to Philip II., although in reality he was opposed to it. He sought to restore the ecclesiastical courts and the episcopal jurisdiction, and one of his last official acts was the reenforcement of the statute *De hæretico comburendo*. The chief works of Gardiner were. *De vera obedientia* (London, 1535 ; Eng. transl. by M. Wood, Geneva [?], 1553); *Conquestio ad M. Bucerum de ejusdem pseudologia* (Louvain, 1544); *A Detection of the Devil's Sophistry* (London, 1546); *An Explanation and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith, Touching the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar* (Rouen, 1551); *Palinodia libri de vera obedientia* (Paris, 1552); and *Epistolæ ad J. Checum de pronuntiatione linguæ Græcæ* (Basel, 1555). A few minor works also exist in manuscript.

Bibliography: Sources are: *Calendars of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*, ed. Brewer and Gairdner, 2 vols., London, 1884. Consult: C. H. and T. Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, i. 139–140, ib 1858; J. B. Mullinger, *Hist. of University of Cambridge*, ii. 58–63, ib. 1888; S. R. Maitland, *Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation*, ib. 1899; *DNB*, xx. 419–425 (careful and authoritative).

GARISSOLES, gā″rĭ″sōl′, **ANTOINE:** French Protestant; b. at Montauban (110 m. s.e. of Bordeaux) June, 1587; d. there Mar., 1651. He was pastor at Puylaurens from 1610 to 1620, when he was called to Montauban. He was professor of theology at the Academy of Montauban from Oct., 1527. till his death, and with the exception of Chamier and Cameron, he is the best-known lecturer of this ancient institution. In 1645 he presided at the Synod of Charenton and distinguished himself by his successful resistance to royal demands that menaced Protestant liberties. At this synod he also attacked the doctrine of mediate imputation of Placæus. His works include: *La voie du salut exposée en huit sermons* (Montauban, 1637); *Decreti synodici Carentoniensis* (1648); *Theses theologicæ* (1648); *Disputationes elenchticæ* (1650); and *Catechesios ecclesiarum in Gallia* (Geneva, 1656).

Bibliography: *Bulletin de la société du protestantisme français*, 1874; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 408–409.

GARLANDS: Garlands and flowers played an important part in the private and public life of the ancient Egyptians. The court used a hundred garlands daily for the adornment of wine-vessels, and at festal repasts the guests decked themselves with wreaths. Flowers were offered to the gods and the sarcophagus of the dead was entwined with them. The use of wreaths and flowers by Greeks and Romans is well known. The Israelites had no especial fondness for flowers, although it may be mere accident that there is no mention of flower-gardens. The use of green sprays and flowers for personal adornment at banquets, marriage feasts, and on other festival occasions was, however, not foreign to the Israelites (Isa. xxviii. 1; cf. Ezek. xxiii. 42; Cant. iii. 11; III Macc. iv. 8). Later, under the influence of Hellenism, this custom became general; fragrant flowers were regarded as elements of a cheerful and joyous life (Wisd. of Sol. ii. 8); joy and mirth found expression in the adornment of the person and house with garlands (III Macc. vii. 16; Ecclus. vi. 31, xv. 6). Garland and crown are used as metaphors for ornament and honor of every kind (Job xix. 9; Prov. xii. 4, xiv. 24). It does not appear, however, that garlands were used in religious observances; at least there is no mention of the adornment of the Temple with natural flowers. To place wreaths upon sacrificial animals was a pagan custom (Acts xiv. 13). Only at the Feast of Tabernacles, according to later usage, those who took part in the procession carried branches of citron and palm.

I. Benzinger.

Bibliography: Tertullian, *De corona;* B. Ugolini, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxx., 34 vols., Venice, 1744–69; L. Löw, in *Ben Chananja*, 1867, nos. 11, 12; *DB*, i. 529–531; *EB*, i. 723, 963; *JE*, iv. 369–370; and στέψανος in the lexicons

GARNET, HENRY HIGHLAND: Colored Presbyterian, United States minister and consul-general to Liberia; b. at New Market, Md., Dec. 23, 1815; d. in Monrovia, Liberia, Feb. 13, 1882. He was born in slavery, but escaped with his father to the North and settled in New York City in 1826. He was educated at the Canaan Academy (N. H.) and at the Oneida Institute, near Utica, N. Y., where he was graduated in 1840. He was licensed to preach in 1842 and was thereupon pastor in Troy for nearly ten years. In 1850 he went to Europe in the interest of the free-labor movement and for three years lectured in Great Britain on slavery. In 1851 he was a delegate to the peace conference at Frankfort, and in 1853 he went to Jamaica as a missionary for the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. He was pastor of the Shiloh Presbyterian Church, New York, 1855–65, and of a church in Washington, D. C., 1865–69. He then

became president of Avery College, but soon resigned this position and returned to Shiloh Church. He was appointed minister and consul-general to Liberia in June, 1881.

GARNIER, gär"nyê', **JEAN:** French Jesuit; b. at Paris Nov 11, 1612; d. at Bologna Oct. 26, 1681. He joined the order of the Jesuits at the age of sixteen, and soon demonstrated his theological talent and his aptness for study and teaching. For forty years he held professorships of ancient languages, rhetoric, theology, and philosophy, and published numerous works, the value of which could not be denied even by enemies of the order. Of lasting importance are his Pelagian studies, comprising a work on the Pelagian Bishop Julian of Eclanum (*Juliani Eclanensis episcopi libellus fidei primum editus cum notis et dissertationibus tribus*, Paris, 1648), as well as his edition of the writings of Marius Mercator (1673) with a commentary and treatises on Pelagianism. Such was the excellence of this latter work that when Cardinal Noris saw it, he declared that his own book on the history of the Pelagian heresy would have remained unwritten if he had seen the *Marius Mercator* at an earlier date. In 1675 Garnier edited the *Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* of the Carthage archdeacon Liberatus, appending learned notes and excursus of his own. He also discussed other problems of church history in the three dissertations which he appended to his *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* (1680). After the death of Garnier his supplement to the works of Theodoret was edited by Hardouin, a brother of the same order, with a preface containing a biography of the author (Paris, 1684). His earliest works, *Organi philosophiæ rudimenta* (Paris, 1651) and *Regulæ fidei catholicæ de gratia Dei per Jesum Christum* (Bourges, 1655), are less noteworthy. He wrote also *Tractatus de officiis confessoris erga singula pœnitentium genera* (Paris, 1689), and *Systema bibliothecæ collegii Parisiensis S. J.* (1678).

Bibliography: H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, ii. 484, 831, Innsbruck, 1893; De Backer, *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus*, ed. C. Sommervogel, iii. 1228 sqq., Paris, 1892; *KL*, v. 104–105.

GARNIER, JULIEN: French Benedictine of the Congregation of St. Maur; b. at Connerré (16 m. e. of Le Mans) c. 1670; d. at Charenton (5 m. s.e. of Paris) June 3, 1725. In 1699 he joined the Maurist order, and became the collaborator of the famous Dom Mabillon. His thorough knowledge of the Greek language and literature led his order to entrust him with the preparation of a new edition of the works of Basil, and after 1701 he devoted all his time and energy to this tremendous undertaking. The first volume appeared after twenty years of uninterrupted toil (Paris, 1721), and in the following year he published the second. His labors had worn him out, however, and he died before the publication of the third volume, which was prepared by Dom Prudent Maran (1730).

Bibliography: H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, ii. 1106, Innsbruck, 1893.

GARRETT, ALEXANDER CHARLES: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Dallas, Tex.; b. at Ballymote (13 m. s.w. of Sligo), County Sligo, Ireland, Nov. 4, 1832. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1855), was ordered deacon (1856) and ordained priest (1857). After being curate of East Worldham, Hampshire (1856–59), he was a missionary in British Columbia for ten years, being evening lecturer at the cathedral in Victoria, missionary to the Indians, naval chaplain at Esquimalt, rector of St. Paul's, Nanaims, and missionary to the miners at Cariboo. He was rector of St. James', San Francisco (1870–72), and dean of Trinity Cathedral, Omaha, Neb. (1872–74). In 1874 he was consecrated missionary bishop of Northern Texas, and on the creation of the diocese of Dallas in 1895 became bishop of that see. He was the founder of St. Mary's Institute for girls at Dallas, and also secured the erection of St. Matthew's Cathedral in the same city. He has written *Historical Continuity* (New York, 1875) and *The Philosophy of the Incarnation* (Baldwin lectures; 1891).

Bibliography: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 229, New York, 1895.

GARRIGAN, PHILIP JOSEPH: Roman Catholic bishop of Sioux City, Ia.; b. at Cavan (26 m. s.s.e. of Enniskillen), County Cavan, Ireland, Sept. 8, 1840. He was educated at St. Charles' College, Ellicott City, Md. (1862–66), and St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary, Troy, N. Y., from which he was graduated in 1870. After being curate of St. John's, Worcester, Mass. 1870–73, he was vice-president of St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary 1873–1875, and rector of St. Bernard's Church, Fitchburg, Mass., 1875–88. He was then vice-rector of the Catholic University of America, Washington, 1888–1902, and in 1902 was consecrated bishop of the newly created diocese of Sioux City.

GARRUCCI, gär-rū'chî, **RAFFAELE:** Italian Jesuit and archeologist; b. at Naples Jan. 23, 1812; d. at Rome May 5, 1885. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of fourteen, and after 1845 published numerous monographs and books on Christian archeology, including numismatics, epigraphy, painting, sculpture, and the art of the catacombs in all its ramifications. His principal works are : *Antichità dei Bebiani* (Naples, 1845); *La Storia di Isermia* (1848); *Tre sepolchri del cimiterio di Pretestato in Roma* (1852); *Questioni pompejani* (1853); *Inscriptions gravées sur les murs de Pompei* (Brussels, 1854); *Il Crocifisso graffito in casa dei Cesari* (Rome, 1857); *Vetri ornati di figure in oro trovati nei cimitcri dei Cristiani primitivi* (1858); *Monumenti del Museo Lateranense* (2 vols., 1862); *Cimiterio degli antichi Ebrei scoperto in vigna Randanini* (1862); *Storia dell' arte cristiana nei primi otto secoli della chiesa* (6 vols., Prato, 1872–81); and *Le Monete dell' Italia antica* (Rome, 1885). He also prepared the first edition of the *Hagioglypta sive picturæ et sculpturæ sacræ antiquiores præsertim quæ Romæ reperiuntur*, which had been written by Jean l'Heureux (Macarius) as early as 1605 (Paris, 1856).

Bibliography: De Backer, *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus*, ed. C. Sommervogel, vol. iii., Paris, 1892; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, x. 158–180; *KL*, v. 105–108.

GARVE, KARL BERNHARD: German Moravian preacher and hymn-writer; b. at Jeinsen (s. of Hanover) Jan. 24, 1763; d. at Herrnhut (42 m. e. of Dresden) June 21, 1841. His father's house was a meeting-place for the Moravian brethren of that part of Germany, and a candidate from Herrnhut was a private tutor in his father's family. At the age of five Karl was sent to the institution of the Brethren in Zeist, then to Neuwied-on-the-Rhine. His education was completed in the Pædagogium in Niesky and in the theological seminary in Barby. In 1784 he received his first position as teacher at the Pædagogium. In 1789 he became docent of historical and philosophical sciences in the theological seminary. Starting from the criticism of Kant and following closely Jacobi and Reinhold, he endeavored to build a foundation for the Moravian conception of Christianity. But his lectures on philosophy only fostered an aversion to theology and practical service in the Congregation of Brethren so that the authorities were compelled to dismiss Garve in 1797, acknowledging, however, their kindly feelings toward him. From 1799 to 1816 he was successively preacher in the Moravian congregations at Amsterdam, Ebersdorf, Norden, Berlin, and from 1816 to 1836 at Neusalz-on-the-Oder. In 1837 he retired to Herrnhut. [Garve was one of the most noted of the Moravian hymn-writers; his best hymn is probably *Dein Wort, O Herr, ist milder Thau*, translated by Miss Winkworth as "Thy Word, O Lord, like gentle dews."] He wrote: *Christliche Gesänge* (Görlitz, 1825); *Brüdergesänge* (Gnadau, 1827); *Der deutsche Versbau* (Berlin, 1827); *Die Themis der Dichtkunst* (1828); *Die Schule der Weisheit* (Leipsic, 1830); and *Der Volksvertreter* (Carlsruhe, 1839). JOSEPH MÜLLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A notice by his son Leopold appeared in the *Nekrolog der Deutschen*, xix. 1, pp. 609–610. Consult also Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 404–405.

GARVIE, ALFRED ERNEST: English Congregationalist; b. at Zyrardow, Russian Poland, Aug. 28, 1861. He studied at George Watson's College, Edinburgh, and the universities of Glasgow (M.A., 1889) and Oxford (B.A., 1892). After being lecturer at Mansfield College in 1892, he held pastorates at Macduff Congregational Church 1893–95 and at Montrose Congregational Church 1895–1903. In 1903–07 he was professor of the philosophy of theism, comparative religion, and Christian ethics in Hackney and New Colleges, London, of which he has been principal since 1907. He was examiner in Biblical languages and literatures in Edinburgh Congregational Hall 1895–1902, and president of the Hampstead Free Church Council 1906–1907. In theology he is moderately progressive and liberal, and is a Lutheran rather than a Calvinist. He has written *The Ethics of Temperance* (London, 1895); *The Ritschlian Theology* (Edinburgh, 1899); *Commentary on Romans* in *The Century Bible* (London, 1901); *The Gospel for To-Day* (1904); *The Christian Personality* (1904); *My Brother's Keeper* (1905); and *Religious Education* (1906).

GASPARIN, gās″pā″raṅ′, AGÉNOR ÉTIENNE: French Protestant, statesman and author; b. at Orange (18 m. n. of Avignon) July 12, 1810; d. at Geneva May 8, 1871. He studied law in Paris and entered politics. After having held various political appointments he was elected to the Chamber of Deputies from Bastia, Corsica, in 1842. On being defeated for reelection in 1846 he abandoned politics and devoted himself thenceforth to writing and lecturing, chiefly on social and religious subjects. He worked for the abolition of slavery, the suppression of war, the establishment of religious liberty, and the separation of Church and State. In 1849 he settled at Geneva, where he lived till his death. His principal works are: *Esclavage et traité* (Paris, 1838); *Les Intérêts généraux du protestantisme français* (1843); *Christianisme et paganisme* (2 vols., 1846); *Des tables tournantes, du surnaturel en général, et des esprits* (2 vols., 1854; Eng. transl., *Science vs. Modern Spiritualism*, 2 vols., New York, 1857); *Les écoles du doute et l'école de la foi* (Geneva, 1854; Eng. transl., *The Schools of Doubt and the School of Faith*, Edinburgh, 1854); *Un Grand Peuple qui se relève* (Paris, 1861; Eng. transl., *The Uprising of a Great People*, New York, 1861, and London, 1862); *L'Amérique devant l'Europe* (1862; Eng. transl., *America before Europe*, New York and London, 1862); *La Famille* (2 vols., 1865; Eng. transl., *The Family*, London, 1867); *La Liberté morale* (2 vols., 1868); *L'égalité* (1869); *La Conscience* (1872); and *L'église selon l'évangile* (2 vols., 1878). Other translations from Gasparin are: *The Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration* (Edinburgh, 1852), from five articles in the *Archives du Christianisme;* and *The Concessions of the Apostle Paul and the Claims of Truth* (1854), translated from an unpublished manuscript.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Accounts of his life are by T. Borel, Paris, 1878; L. Ruffet, ib. 1884; and C. Barbey-Boissier, 2 vols., Paris, 1902.

GASQUET, FRANCIS AIDAN: English Benedictine; b. in London Oct. 5, 1846. He was graduated at St. Gregory's College, Downside, Bath, in 1864, and entered the Benedictine order in 1865, being a postulant at Belmont Priory, near Hereford, 1865–70 and at Downside Priory 1870–74. In 1874 he was ordained priest, and from 1878 to 1885 was prior of the community, but was compelled to resign on account of ill health. On his recovery he was appointed by Pope Leo XIII. to engage in historical research, and accordingly removed to London. In 1896 he was appointed a member of the commission of Anglican orders, and during a visit in Rome discovered important documents bearing on the controversy. Four years later he was appointed abbot president of the English Benedictines, and in this capacity controls four monasteries and over 300 monks. He has written *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries* (2 vols., London, 1888); *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer* (in collaboration with Edmund Bishop; 1890); *The Great Pestilence* (1893); *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury* (1895); *A Sketch of Monastic Constitutional History* (1896); *The Old English Bible, and Other Essays* (1897); *The Eve of the Reformation* (1900); *A Short History of the Catholic Church in England* (1903); *English Monastic Life* (1903); *Henry the Third and the Church* (1905); *Lord Acton and his Circle* (1906); *Parish Life in Mediæ-*

val England (1906); and *The Black Death of 1348 and 1349* (1908). He has also edited Montalembert's *Monks of the West* (6 vols., London, 1895); William Cobbett's *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland* (1896); *Vita Antiquissima Beati Gregorii Magni* (1903); and *Analecta Anglo-Premonstratensia* (1904).

GASS, (FRIEDRICH) WILHELM (JOACHIM HEINRICH): German Protestant; b. at Breslau Nov. 28, 1813; d. at Heidelberg Feb. 21, 1889. As a mere child he learned Greek, before undertaking the study of Latin, from Franz Passow, professor at Breslau, and thus laid the foundation for his later researches in Greek Christianity. After attending the gymnasia at Breslau and Schweidnitz he entered the University of Breslau in 1832 to study theology, but was at first interested chiefly in philosophy, philology, and belles-lettres. In 1834–1835 he studied at Halle, being influenced especially by Gesenius, Wegscheider, and Thilo, later at Berlin, where Neander exerted a deep influence upon him. In 1836 he returned to Breslau (Ph.D., 1836; Th.Lic., 1839) and established himself as privat-docent of theology there in 1839. In 1846 he became professor extraordinary at Breslau, and in 1847 at Greifswald, where he was made full professor in 1855. In 1862 he became professor of systematic theology at Giessen, whence he went to Heidelberg in 1868 as the successor of R. Rothe. Here he taught, besides systematic theology, New Testament exegesis and hymnology. As representative of the faculty of Heidelberg, he took part in the general synods of 1871, 1876, and 1881, advocating a moderate liberalism. In 1885 he was appointed church councilor.

Gass was a strong advocate of the Evangelical union, and was one of the most learned among the masters of German Evangelical theology. His works are distinguished by diligent research and rest upon a conscientious and intelligent use of the sources. He first directed his attention to the history of the Greek Church in the Middle Ages, a field almost entirely neglected until his time. His first work, *Gennadius und Pletho* (Breslau, 1844), treats of the struggle of Aristotelianism and Platonism during this period. In *Die Mystik des Nikolaus Kabasilas, vom Leben in Christo* (Greifswald, 1849) he edited for the first time the "Life in Christ" of Kabasilas, metropolitan of Thessalonica about 1350, and gave an interesting sketch of the history of Greek mysticism. He wrote also *Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Giessen, 1865) and collected his smaller contributions to the history of dogma in the Greek Church in *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche* (Berlin, 1872), the first comprehensive work on this theme since Heineccius' *Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche* (Leipsic, 1711). Gass tried to present a critical description of the character of the Greek Church, by considering not only its dogmatic tradition, but also its rites, liturgy, and worship, and the spiritual, national, and moral conditions in general. He also rendered valuable service to the history of Protestant dogmatics by his *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik* (4 vols., Berlin, 1854–1867), which presents the dogmatic development from Melanchthon to Schleiermacher. In his later years Gass devoted himself to the study of Christian ethics. His most important works in this field are: *Die Lehre vom Gewissen* (Berlin, 1869), *Optimismus und Pessimismus* (1876), and *Geschichte der Ethik* (2 vols. in 3, 1881–87). Of other works may be mentioned: *Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus* (Breslau, 1846) and *Das Recht der Union, eine Schutzrede* (Giessen, 1867). He also edited Schleiermacher's *Briefwechsel mit J C. Gass* (his father, Berlin, 1852), and with A. Vial, E. L. T. Henke's posthumous *Neuere Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols, Halle, 1874–80). With H. Reuter and T. Brieger he edited, after 1876, the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (Gotha, 1876 sqq.). G. GRÜTZMACHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Badische Biographieen*, ed. F. von Weech, iv. 527–536, Carlsruhe, 1891. The funeral oration, by H. Basserman, is in *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1889, pp. 251 sqq.

GASS, gās, JOACHIM CHRISTIAN: German theologian; b. at Leopoldshagen (a suburb of Anklam, 47 m. n.w. of Stettin) May 26, 1766; d. at Breslau Feb. 19, 1831. He began his education at the monastic school at Bergen, studied theology and philosophy at Halle 1785–89, and in 1795 was appointed field chaplain in Borcke's regiment, and preacher at the garrison at Stettin. As a theologian he early departed from orthodoxy, although he endeavored to restore the beautiful "individuality" of Christianity, his *Beiträge zur Verbreitung eines religiösen Sinnes in Predigten* (Stettin, 1801) giving evidence of this desire. In 1806 the Napoleonic war took Gass to Halle, where he met Schleiermacher, who had been his close friend for three years, and Steffens. Gass soon returned to Stettin, but the disbanding of his regiment in the latter half of 1807, together with domestic troubles, led him to settle in Berlin, where he was appointed preacher at the Marienkirche. In 1810 he was called to Breslau, where he remained until his death, officiating as Konsistorialrat and as a member of the church and school committees of the government of Silesia. When the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder was transferred to Breslau in 1811, Gass was given the chair of systematic theology. As a theologian, he was a follower of Schleiermacher, although he did not absorb the latter's doctrinal idiosyncrasies. In the beginning of his career as a member of the Silesian consistory, Gass was in accord with the highest functionaries, but later he sided with the opposition. His attitude during the controversies regarding union, organization, and ritual may be gathered partly from his letters to Schleiermacher and partly from the *Jahrbuch des protestantischen Kirchen- und Schulwesens von und für Schlesien* (2 vols., Breslau, 1818–20), which he edited. Among his other works the most important are the following: *Ueber den christlichen Cultus* (Breslau, 1815); *An meine evangelischen Mitbürger* (1823); *Ueber den Religionsunterricht in den oberen Klassen der Gymnasien* (1828); and *Ueber den Reichstag zu Speyer von 1529* (1827). (W. GASS†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Schleiermacher, *Briefwechsel mit J. C. Gass*, Berlin, 1852; *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben, in Briefen*, Berlin, 1858, Eng. transl., *The Life of Schleiermacher as Unfolded in his Autobiography and Letters*, London, 1860.

GASSENDI, gas-sen'dî, **PIERRE:** French Roman Catholic philosopher and mathematician; b. at Champtercier, near Digne (55 m. n.e. of Aix), Jan. 22, 1592; d. at Paris Oct. 24, 1655. He was educated at Digne and Aix. At sixteen he was offered an instructorship in rhetoric at Digne, and in 1613 he became professor of theology at Aix. In 1617 he took orders, and was then professor of philosophy at Aix till 1623, when he resigned his position for a canonry at Grenoble. In 1633 he became provost of the cathedral at Digne, and in 1645 professor of mathematics at the Collège Royal in Paris. Gassendi is known chiefly as an opponent of Descartes, and as the reviver of Epicureanism, which he endeavored to harmonize with Christianity. He adopted Epicurus's atomistic physics, his empirical theory of knowledge, his hedonistic ethics, and also his view of the freedom of the will. He held that God created the atoms and endowed them with certain properties, but that he also exercises a supervision over them. Gassendi prepared the way for the empiricism of Condillac and Locke and occupies an important place in the history of atomistic philosophy. Aside from a number of polemical writings against Descartes, his principal works are, *Exercitationes paradoxiæ versus Aristoteles* (bk. i., Grenoble, 1624; bk. ii. The Hague, 1659); *De vita moribus et doctrina Epicuri* (Lyons, 1647); *Institutio astronomica* (Paris, 1647); and *Syntagma philosophiæ Epicuri* (Lyons, 1849).

Bibliography: De Camhurat, *Abrégé de la vie et du système de Gassendi*, Bouillon, 1770; C. Jeannel, *Gassendi spiritualiste*, Montpellier, 1859. Works on his philosophy are by: L. Mandon, ib. 1861; P. F. Thomas, Paris, 1889.

GAST, gāst, **FREDERICK AUGUSTUS:** German Reformed; b. at Lancaster, Pa., Oct. 17, 1835. He studied at Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. (B.A., 1856), and the Mercersburg Theological Seminary (1856–57). In 1859 he was ordained, and was pastor at New Holland, Pa., 1859–65 and at Loudon and St. Thomas, Pa., 1865–67, in addition to being chaplain of the Forty-fifth Pennsylvania Volunteers from March to July, 1865. He was principal of the academy of Franklin and Marshall College 1867–71, assistant professor in the college 1871–72, and tutor in the theological seminary at Lancaster 1872–74. Since 1874 he has been professor of Hebrew and Old Testament theology in the same institution.

GATAKER, gat'a-ker, **THOMAS:** English Puritan; b. in London Sept. 4, 1574; d. at Rotherhithe (2 m. s.e. of St. Paul's) July 27, 1654. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was appointed to a fellowship in the newly founded Sidney Sussex College in 1596. After preaching for a few months at Everton, near Cambridge, he went to London in 1600, where he preached occasionally at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields and served as tutor in the family of Sir William Cooke. In 1601 he received the lectureship at Lincoln's Inn, and in 1611 the rectory of Rotherhithe, which he held till his death. In 1643 he was nominated a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and in 1644 he was put upon the committee for examining ministers. He had previously declined the mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1645 he was a member of a committee to select persons to translate the directory of worship into Welsh, and also of the committee of seven charged with the preparation of the first draft of a confession of faith. On Jan. 18, 1649, he signed the first address against the trial and execution of the king. In the matter of church government he advocated a modified episcopacy. Gataker was a man of minute scholarship, and his best-known works are his valuable annotated edition of Marcus Aurelius (London, 1652), and his commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations, published in the Assembly's *Annotations* (1645, 1651). Other works are: *Of the Nature and Use of Lots* (London, 1619); *A Discussion of the Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation* (1624); *A Short Catechism* (1624); and *Sermons* (2 parts, 1637). H. Witsius edited his *Opera critica* (2 vols., Utrecht, 1697–98).

Bibliography: Sources are his own *Discours Apologetical*, London, 1654; his autohiography in the posthumous *Adversaria Miscellanea*, ib. 1659; and *Gray Hayres Crowned with Grace, a Funeral Sermon with Memoir*, 1655. Consult: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 1257, 4 vols., ih. 1813–20; B. Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, iii. 200, ih. 1813; D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, iii. 451, ih. 1822; A. F. Mitchell, *Westminster Assembly and Standards*, passim, ih. 1883; *DNB*, xxi. 60–62.

GAUDEN, gō'den, **JOHN:** Bishop of Worcester; b. at Mayland (35 m. e.n.e. of London) 1605; d. at Worcester Sept. 20, 1662. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1623; M.A., 1626), and at Wadham College, Oxford (B.D., 1635; D.D., 1641). In 1640 he became vicar of Chippenham and chaplain to the earl of Warwick, through whose influence he was nominated to the deanery of Bocking in 1641. On Nov. 29, 1640, he preached before the House of Commons. He was a member of the Westminster Assembly in 1643, but on account of his conservative views on episcopacy was soon removed from that body. Although he opposed the policy of Cromwell and published a number of books in behalf of the Church of England, he conformed to Presbyterianism and continued to hold his preferments throughout the Protectorate. At the Restoration in 1660 he was made chaplain to the king and bishop of Exeter, and in 1662 he was translated to the see of Worcester. He was a member of the Savoy Conference (q.v.); and according to Baxter, if all had possessed his moderation the Episcopalians and Presbyterians would have been quickly reconciled. Gauden was probably the author of *Eikōn Basilikē; the Portraiture of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings* (1648), an ostensible work of Charles I. that quickly passed through twenty-seven editions. The book was translated into Latin and was attacked by Milton in his *Eikonoclastes* (1649). It is a defense of the king's conduct and an account of his misfortunes from 1640 to 1648, interpolated with prayers and meditations.

Bibliography: On the authorship of *Eikōn Basilikē* consult C. Wordsworth, *Who Wrote Εικων βασιλικη?* Cambridge, 1824; idem, *King Charles I., Author of Icon Basilike*, ib. 1828; H. J. Todd, *A Letter . . concerning the Authorship*, 1825. On Gauden consult: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 612–618, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; T. Baker, *Hist. of College of St. John*,

ed. J. E. B. Mayor, pp. 266, 678, Cambridge, 1869; G. Oliver, *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter*, pp. 150–151, London, 1861; *DNB*, xxi. 69–72.

GAUDENTIUS: Bishop of Brixia (the present Brescia); b. probably at Brixia c. 360; d. probably soon after 410. He was a pupil of Philastrius (q.v.) and may have been consecrated by him. He was absent on a journey to Jerusalem and Cappadocia when Philastrius died, and clergy and people unanimously chose him bishop and asked for his return. Gaudentius accepted the position reluctantly, entering on his duties about 387 Little is known of his further activity. With two other deputies of the Emperor Honorius and of the Roman Bishop Innocent I. he went to Greece to intercede for Chrysostom (q.v.) before the Emperor Arcadius; the mission was unsuccessful, but Gaudentius won Chrysostom's gratitude by his act of love. Gaudentius must have been still alive in 410, in which year Rufinus dedicated to him his translation of the *Recognitiones* of Clement.

Gaudentius wrote a number of small treatises, among them ten sermons on Easter (c. 390), which are dedicated to a certain Benevolus who was prevented by sickness from attending service in the church. The first sermon is addressed to candidates for baptism and treats of the celebration of Easter on the basis of Ex. xii.; the others were delivered before baptized persons. Six of them treat of Christ, the true paschal lamb, and the Lord's Supper; the eighth and ninth, of the wedding-feast at Cana and virginity; the tenth, of Easter in particular and of Sunday in general. With these ten sermons go eleven addresses on miscellaneous subjects, and two letters. The addresses are plain and simple and by no means deficient in beautiful thoughts. Like his contemporaries he shows an inclination to allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

(K. Leimbach†.)

Bibliography. An excellent edition of the sermons is by P. Gagliardi, Padua, 1720, reproduced essentially in *MPL*, xx. 827–1002. On the life of Gaudentius consult: *ASB*, Oct., xi. 587–604; *MPL*, xx. 791–826; G. Brunati, *Leggendario o vite di santi Bresciani*, pp. 73–104, Brescia, 1834; J. Nirschl, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik*, ii. 488–493, Mainz, 1883.

GAULANITIS, gō″lą-nī′tis: A district to the east of the Sea of Galilee and of the upper Jordan. According to Eusebius (*Onomasticon*, 242), the name is derived from Gaulon, the name of a large town, the Golan in Bashan of the Old Testament and the Gaulana of Josephus (*Ant.* IV., vii. 4). The name is used in Josephus with varying signification. Sometimes it is the equivalent of Bashan, though again he sets off from it the regions of Trachonitis and Batanea, thus restricting it to the district immediately bordering the Sea of Galilee and the Jordan. The last is the better usage. There is a division of the district into Upper and Lower Gaulanitis. The boundaries are only in part distinguishable.

Names and Extent. The deep bed and abrupt banks of the Yarmuk are the fixed natural southern limits. Equally certain is the western boundary on the Sea of Galilee and the Jordan, except that Hippo and Paneas are not always reckoned as belonging to it. The northern and eastern limits are uncertain, except as marked on the north by the foot of Hermon. On the southeast the tributaries of the Yarmuk make a sharp demarcation in the plain, yet neither the Nahr al-Rukkad nor the Nahr al-Allan is recognized as the boundary From the fact that Saham al-Jaulan was once reckoned to this district, the boundaries must once have extended beyond the Nahr al-Allan, eastward, therefore, as far as the upper course of the Yarmuk. In Josephus (*Life*, 37) the modern Sulam (*Seleima* in the inscriptions; cf. Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscriptions*, iii. 543) at the foot of Jabal Hauran, and so the southern part of Batanea or Hauran, belonged to Gaulanitis, extending the district as far as the Lejjah, at least as a governmental province. Herod the Great drew 3,000 Idumeans and 600 Jews from Trachonitis and Batanea to check the Arab marauders.

History. The name enters history in the account by Josephus of the campaigns of Alexander Jannæus (102–76 B.C.), who conquered Golan, Seleucia, and Gamala from a certain Demetrius. Pompey (63 B.C.) assigned Golan to the province of Syria and left Hippo free (*Ant.* XIV., iv. 4; *War*, I., vii. 7). Under Augustus the district belonged to Herod the Great, and after his death it went to the tetrarchy of his son Philip, while Hippo was a part of the province of Syria. It belonged to the province of Syria during the period 34–37 A.D., and was then granted by Caligula to Agrippa I. (*Ant.* XVIII., vi. 10), after whose death (44 A.D.) it was included in the general control of Palestine until in the year 53 it was granted by Claudius to Agrippa II., whose death caused it to return to the government of Syria.

Principal Cities. Hippo lay at an elevation of 1,500 feet above the Sea of Galilee. The Talmud gives the Aramaic name as Susita, the Susiyah of the Arabic geographers, where are extensive ruins half an hour west of Fik in the lower Jaulan, Fik being the old Aphek, not far from Hippo (Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, 219, 91). The site of Hippo, however, lies one hour west of Fik. The inhabitants were largely Greeks. According to Josephus (*Life*, 9), the district belonging to the city was so extensive that it bordered upon the districts belonging to Gadara, Scythopolis, and Tiberias. About four miles to the north, on the bank of the Wadi al-Samak are some ruins, including the remains of a wall and a tower, called by the Arabs al-Sur (connected with *kursi*, "a seat"), recognized by many scholars as the site of the city of the Gerasenes, Gergesenes, or Gadarenes of Matt. viii. 28 sqq., Mark v. 1 sqq., and Luke viii. 26 sqq. (see Gerasenes). The investigations of W A. Neumann in the region lead him to see in Jabal Kurein Jaradi, the name of a hill to the north, the traces of the old place-name, which he would read Gerada, not Gadara. Not far from the entrance of the Jordan into the sea lay the fishing village Bethsaida, built by Herod Philip into a city and named Julias in honor of Julia, daughter of Augustus. Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, V., xv. 71) locates it on the east coast. The fishing village is best placed at al-Araj, immediately on the sea, where the fishermen still land and dry their nets. Possibly the city is to

be located at al-Tell, where the Arabs have their winter huts. Leading New Testament refcrences to the place are Mark vi. 30–44; cf. Luke ix. 10 sqq.; Mark viii. 22; John i. 44, xii. 21. The question of a second Bethsaida in Galilee is to be decided in the negative, since that province was often regarded as extending eastward of the Sea of Galilee. The residents of Bethsaida were Jews. According to Mark viii. 27, Jesus led his disciples from Bethsaida to the villages of Cæsarea Philippi, on which journey Peter made his celebrated confession (verse 29). Cæsarea Philippi lay in the district of Paneas (Banias), named from Pan and the celebrated grotto of the source of the Jordan (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 17). Near this grotto Herod the Great erected a splendid temple, about which his son Philip built a city which he named Cæsarea after the emperor (Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII., ii. 1). Agrippa II. extended it and renamed it Neronias after Nero, a name which did not adhere, since Cæsarea Philippi, or Cæsarea Paneas, or Paneas is the usual designation. It was a favorite resort of Vespasian and Titus for rest from the exertions of war. The population was prevailingly heathen. Of the places inland from the sea little is known. The ruins now called Selukiyah doubtless mark Seleucia. The situation of the strong fortress of Gamala can not be certainly identified. Since Kalat al-Hozn has been given up, the village Jamli is regarded as a probable site, located by Schumacher on the east bank of the gorge of the Nahr al-Rukkad. Furrer and Van Kasteren place it on the Tell al-Ahdeib or Ras al-Hal, between Jamli and the Rukkad. The conjunction of the ruins and the present name (Jamli) makes this identification probable. The place was conquered by Alexander Jannæus (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII., xv. 3), and by the Romans under Vespasian after a siege of a month (Josephus, *Wars*, IV., i. 1 sqq.). Gamala was the center of a toparchy. Another Gamala mentioned in *Ant.* XVIII., v. 1 is perhaps the Jamli discovered by Schumacher in Ajlun. The Bathyra built by Herod the Great is probably the modern Bait Ari, south from Jamli. See Trachonitis. (H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, London, 1897; U. J. Seetzen, *Reisen*, vols. i., iv., Berlin, 1854–59; J. G. Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran*, Berlin, 1860; idem, *Das batanäische Giebelgebirge*, Leipsic, 1884; A. Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, Paris, 1868; P. Le Bas and W. H. Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines*, vol. iii., Paris, 1870; C. R. Conder and H. H. Kitchener, *Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, vol. i., London, 1881, S. Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, ib. 1881; W. M. Thomson, *Land and Book, Central Palestine*, ib. 1883; G. Schumacher, *Across the Jordan*, ib. 1886; idem, *The Jaulan*, ib. 1888; P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, Göttingen, 1887; W. A. Neumann, *Qurn Dscheradi*, Freiburg, 1894; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palästina*, Freiburg, 1896; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 427, ii. 4, 12–13, Eng. transl., I. ii. 12, II. i. 2–4.

GAUSSEN, gō″sān′, ETIENNE: French Protestant; b. at Nîmes at the beginning of the seventeenth century; d. at Saumur (100 m. s.w. of Orléans) 1675. He became professor of philosophy in the academy at Saumur in 1651 and in 1665 professor of theology. He was rector of the academy in 1667 The school of Saumur represented at that time a more liberal conception of French Protestantism than did the schools of Sédan and Montauban; and Gaussen contributed much to propagate this conception. His works were highly rated by his contemporaries, and up to the middle of the eighteenth century they were frequently reprinted, both in Holland and Germany. To be mentioned particularly are: *De consensu gratiæ cum natura* (Saumur, 1659); *De verbo dei* (1665); and *Quattuor dissertationes theologicæ* (1670), including *De ratione studii theologici, De natura theologiæ, de ratione concionandi,* and *De utilitate philosophiæ ad theologiam,* forming, according to Bayle, the best manual of the time for the study of theology.

Bibliography: E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. H. L. Bordier, vol. v., Paris, 1886; *Bulletin du protestantisme français*, i. 311, ii. 158, 327; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 441–442.

GAUSSEN, FRANÇOIS SAMUEL ROBERT LOUIS: Swiss clergyman; b. at Geneva Aug. 25, 1790; d. there June 18, 1863. Two years after completing his studies at the university of his native city (1814), he was appointed minister at Satigny, near Geneva, where he succeeded Cellerier, one of the few members of the Swiss clergy who clung to orthodoxy, and who exercised a profound influence on the formation of Gaussen's theological convictions. The period was almost contemporaneous with the dawn of the religious revival in French Switzerland. This awakening resulted in the issuance of an order (May 7, 1817) by the *Vénérable compagnie des pasteurs,* practically prohibiting the preaching of certain important doctrines of divinity. Gaussen and Cellerier protested against this ruling in 1819, chiefly by republishing the new French edition of the Helvetic Confession, to which they added a preface in which they declared that a Church must have a declaration of faith, and that the Second Helvetic Confession correctly voiced their personal convictions. In the meantime Gaussen pursued his clerical duties in Satigny, besides holding religious meetings in his own home, as well as in his mother's house in Geneva, striving to revivify the national church, but not advocating separation from it. At Geneva, which gradually became the center of his activity, Gaussen founded a missionary society, which held meetings, first in private houses and later in the church. In 1828, through the intervention of the *Vénérable compagnie,* certain new members were elected to its committee whom Gaussen considered heterodox in their views, and he therefore withdrew from the society. This conflict with the clergy of Geneva was the precursor of frequent storms which influenced his future career. Calvin's catechism had long been used as a basis for the instruction of the young, but the *Vénérable compagnie* now substituted another in its stead, and ordered Gaussen to use it. He tried to do so, but found it unsatisfactory and laid it aside. The clergy of Geneva lodged a complaint against him, and after a lengthy dispute he was finally censured by the *compagnie,* and deprived of his right to take part in its meetings for a period of one year (cf. *Lettres de Mr. le Pasteur Gaussen à la vénérable compagnie des pasteurs de Genève,* 1831; and *Exposé historique des discussions élevées entre la compagnie des pasteurs de Genève et Mr. Gaussen,* 1831) With his friends,

Merle d'Aubigné and Galland, Gaussen now founded an "Evangelical Society" to distribute Bibles and tracts, and to interest the public in missionary work among the heathen. Shortly afterward the Evangelical Society decided to found a school for the dissemination of Evangelical teachings, and this resolve was imparted to the state councilor of Geneva, as well as to the churches, in circular letters signed by Galland, Merle d'Aubigné, and Gaussen. Gaussen was accordingly deposed by the consistory on Sept. 30, 1831, while his two colleagues were suspended. For a long time he traveled through Italy and England, awakening strong sympathy for his cause in the latter country, but viewing the Roman Catholic Church with extreme disfavor. In 1834 he returned to Geneva, and accepted the chair of dogmatics at the newly established theological school. He inclined strictly toward Reformed Orthodoxy, and deviated from its doctrines only with regard to his theory of predestination, accepting the teaching of election by grace but denying supralapsarianism. Three points of Evangelical theology were especially treated by Gaussen: the divinity of Christ, the prophecies, and the divine authority of Holy Scripture. In his *Théopneustie* (Geneva, 1840; Eng. transl., *Theopneustia; the plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, London, 1841) he maintained that all passages in the Old and New Testaments were verbally inspired, but his theory of inspiration was attacked by members of his own theological school, and later also by Edmund Scherer, and he accordingly wrote, in vindication, *Le Canon des Saintes Écritures au double point de vue de la science et de la foi* (Lausanne, 1860; Eng transl., *Canon of the Holy Scriptures as Viewed Through Science and Faith*, London, 1862). He was also the author of numerous other works, including *Leçons sur Daniel* (3 vols., uncompleted, 1861; Eng. transl., *The Prophet Daniel Explained*, 1873–74), consisting of several of his catechetical lectures on Daniel; and of *Les premiers chapîtres de l'Exode*, and *Le prophète Jonas* (the latter two published posthumously). His works enjoyed a wide circulation both in England and in France. (E. Bardet†.)

Bibliography: H. von der Goltz, *Die reformierte Kirche Genfs im 19. Jahrhundert*, pp. 103, 289, 467, Basel, 1862; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 442–443.

GAUTAMA. See Buddhism.

GAUTIER, gō″tyê′, CHARLES LUCIEN: Swiss Reformed; b. at Cologny (2 m. n.e. of Geneva), Switzerland, Aug. 17, 1850. He studied in Geneva (B.Lit., 1867; B. Théol., 1874), Tübingen, and Leipsic (Ph.D., 1877), and was professor of Old Testament exegesis and theology at Lausanne (Free Church of the Canton of Vaud) from 1877 to 1898, when he retired as honorary professor. He was president of the synod of the Free Church of the Canton of Vaud in 1885, 1886, 1891, and 1892. In theology he is Evangelical in his sympathies, although not an enemy of the critical school. He has written *Le Sacerdoce dans l'Ancien Testament* (Geneva, 1874); *Ad-Dourra al-Fâkhira, la perle précieuse de Ghazali: traité d'eschatologie musulmane* (1878); *La Mission du prophète Ezéchiel* (Lausanne, 1891); *Au delà du Jourdain* (Geneva, 1895); *Souvenirs de Terre-Sainte* (Lausanne, 1898); *Vocations des prophètes* (1901); *Autour de la Mer Morte* (Geneva, 1901); and *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (2 vols., Lausanne, 1906).

GAVAZZI, gā-vāt′sî, ALESSANDRO: One of the founders of the "Free Church of Italy" (see Italy); b. at Bologna Mar. 21, 1809; d. at Rome Jan. 9, 1889. He entered the Order of Barnabites in 1825, and four years later became professor of rhetoric at Naples. His radical views soon attracted unfavorable notice, and in 1840 he was transferred to a subordinate position in the States of the Church. He welcomed the election of Pius IX. and enthusiastically supported the liberal movement which marked the beginning of the new régime. Appointed chaplain of the Roman troops sent to Lombardy, he assisted in inciting resistance to Austria, but was arrested at Vicenza and confined at Corneto until released by the inhabitants of Viterbo. The change in the papal policy, however, filled him with hatred of the pope, and on the capture of Rome and the reinstatement of Pius in 1849, he fled to England and renounced his faith. He then became pastor of a Protestant Italian congregation in London, and lectured in England, Scotland, and Ireland against his former religion. In 1860 he joined the army of Garibaldi as a chaplain, and after the establishment of the kingdom of Italy resided in Rome, where in 1877 he started a theological seminary for the "Free Church," of which he was the principal founder (see Italy), and officiated as professor of dogmatics, apologetics, and polemics. Among his numerous works special mention may be made of the following: *Memoirs* (London, 1851); *Orations* (1851); *Lectures in New York* (New York, 1853); *Recollections of the Last Four Popes* (London, 1858); *Records of Two Years' Christian Work in Italy* (1865); *La Bibbia regola di fede degli evangelici* (Florence, 1868); *Dei Concilî ecumenici* (1869); *No Union with Rome* (London, 1871); and *The Priest in Absolution* (1877).

Bibliography: G. M. Campanella and G. B. Nicolini, *Biography of Father Gavazzi*, New York, 1853 (prefixed to the *Lectures*); J. W. King, *Alessandro Gavazzi: a Biography*, London, 1860.

GEBAL ("Mountain"): **1.** A Phenician city of seamen and merchants engaged in the Mediterranean trade, mentioned Ezek. xxvii. 9 and perhaps referred to in Josh. xiii. 5; I Kings v. 18. The name is preserved in the modern Jibeil, about 20 m. n. of Beirut. Its Assyrian name was Gubal or Gubla; the Greeks called it Byblos. The Egyptians knew it before 1500 B.C. as a center of religious life and literature, it figures in the Amarna Tablets (q.v.), important inscriptions have been found there, and it was the home of Philo Herenius, who transmitted the fragments of Sanchuniathon's "History." The modern place is near the shore; probably the older city was on a spur of the mountains, farther inland.

2. A district named in the Bible only in the late Ps. lxxxiii. 7 in connection with Edom, the Ishmaelites, Moab, Ammon, and the Amalekites, whose home was toward the south or southeast of the

Dead Sea, therefore to be located in that region. It is doubtless the modern Jibal of the Arabs, the district located by Josephus (*Ant.* II., i. 2, IX., ix. 1) as near Petra, and by Arabian geographers as the northern part of the region east of the Wadi al-Arabah (the depression south of the Dead Sea).

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DB*, ii. 117; *EB*, ii. 1653–55. On 1, consult: W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, pp. 185 sqq., Leipsic, 1893; E. Renan, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 174 sqq., Paris, 1864; H. Winckler, in *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek*, vol. v., Berlin, 1896. On 2, consult: Robinson, *Researches*, ii. 154; Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London, 1890; F. Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter*, Leipsic, 1893.

GEBHARD II. AND THE COUNTERREFORMATION IN THE LOWER RHINE LANDS.

Protestants in the Lower Rhine Lands (§ 1).
Bavarian Intrigues in Lower Germany (§ 2).
Gebhard II (§ 3).
Gebhard's Downfall (§ 4).
Progress of the Counterreformation (§ 5).

The Reformation nowhere completely permeated the Lower Rhenish districts. Small congregations, it is true, struggled here and there for a modest existence, and a part of the nobility appeared to incline toward the new doctrines; but the new movement was not supported by the towns. In both of the most powerful imperial cities of these regions, Cologne and Aachen, the Roman preponderance in councils and civic life remained unimpaired. But from 1570 onward, the disturbances in the Netherlands having driven countless refugees into the neighboring districts of the Lower Rhine, quite a number of Reformed congregations became established in the duchy of Juliers and Cleves, and in the electorate and city of Cologne. Wesel came to be a center for the new propaganda. At Aachen the Protestants began to contend, after 1574, for the rule of the city. Indeed as early as 1571 there came into effect a firm organization of all these "Netherlandish" congregations, which drew to themselves many of the native Protestants. In spite of sporadic action on the part of the authorities, the congregations were tacitly tolerated, in the main, a contributory factor to this end in the city of Cologne being regard for mercantile relations with the Netherlands; while at the court of Juliers a Protestant party even endeavored to gain a legislative influence over the infirm and vacillating Duke William IV.

1. Protestants in the Lower Rhine Lands.

If therefore the Reformation had nowhere gained the supremacy in these districts, and had not even attained to a position of security, nevertheless, toward the close of the decade 1570–80, Protestants were everywhere to be found, and no Counterreformation tendency was then active. The Jesuits had begun their activity in Cologne soon after their society was founded, and made that point a center of their missionary and literary enterprises in the rest of Germany; but their efforts in Cologne itself never accomplished anything assured and fruitful. They were thwarted by lack of support from the political authorities; the electors showed no interest in the society, and the city council, the clergy, and the university put obstacles in its course. The victory that was eventually achieved at this place by the Counterreformation was owing to the pressure of alien dynastic interests, and the chief part in this result for the Roman cause was played by Bavarian statecraft.

Duke Albert V. of Bavaria had destined his third son, Ernest (b. 1554), for the clerical vocation; in 1565 he became a canon at Salzburg, and soon afterward at Cologne, Treves, and Würzburg as well; in the autumn of 1565 he likewise became bishop of Freising. Albert's wishes no doubt centered upon the neighboring archdiocese of Salzburg; but in 1569, when Elector Salentin of Cologne incurred difficulties with the curia for non-recognition of the Council of Trent and was contemplating resignation, Ernest was proposed by his father, who had the support of the Spanish government at Brussels, as Salentin's successor. At the imperial diet at Spcyer, in 1570, the negotiations with Salentin were so far advanced that Ernest went to Cologne in November, and served his first residence therc as canon till May, 1571, such bcing the preliminary condition in the line of election. Salentin's resignation, however, was deferred, and in 1573 he actually submitted to the Council of Trent, and was thereupon confirmed by the curia as archbishop, foregoing the priestly consecration. In 1577, after the Bavarian court had failed in an attempt to secure Münster for Ernest, efforts looking to Cologne were resumed and prosecuted more zealously than before. Moreover, the support of the curia now heightened the hope of some practical result. Duke Ernest, who for a time, in 1572, had well-nigh thwarted all his father's plans by a suddenly outcropping disinclination toward the spiritual vocation, was sent to Rome in the spring of 1574, for a sojourn of nearly two years, by way of reward for submitting to his father's will. At Rome he won the particular good-will of the pope, so that Gregory XIII. resolved to support, with all his might, Ernest's installation as coadjutor to Salentin; in fact, the advancement of Bavarian family interests appeared to be the only possible way of recovering a more secure standing for the Roman Catholic Church in Lower Germany. The status which had been gained in 1573 by the election of Ernest as bishop of the small see of Hildesheim could not as yet, by itself alone, afford a very trustworthy base of support.

2. Bavarian Intrigues in Lower Germany.

But against the common plans of Salentin, the curia, and the Bavarian court, opposition manifested itself on the side of the chapter at Cologne; when, in 1577, Salentin resigned, Ernest was defeated, at the new election, by Gebhard Truchsess, who was elected by the Protestants and the lukewarm Catholics of the chapter. Duke Albert, as well as the papal nuncio Portia, protested against the election; but as both the emperor and the electors espoused Gebhard's cause, and as he passed for a good Catholic, receiving priestly consecration in Mar., 1578, and swearing to the Council of Trent, the curia disregarded the Bavarian protest and in Mar., 1580, confirmed the election. By that time Duke Albert had died, and his successor, William

V., was ready to come to terms. Ernest received some compensation, in 1581, by obtaining the rich diocese of Liége.

3. Gebhard II.

Gebhard (b. at the Waldburg, 5 m. e.s.e. of Ravensburg, in Swabia, Nov. 10, 1547; d. at Strasburg May 21, 1601) descended from the old Swabian family of the Truchsesses of Waldburg; his father was Imperial Councilor Wilhelm Truchsess; his uncle, Cardinal Otto of Augsburg. A careful education had fallen to his portion, as even at an early age he was destined for the spiritual vocation. He attended, so the accepted report has it, the universities of Dillingen, Ingolstadt, and (longest) Louvain; then terminated his studies with a sojourn in Italy, 1567. His spiritual career began in 1560 with the acquisition of a prebendary position at Augsburg; in 1561 he became canon at Cologne; capitular at Strasburg in 1567; and capitular at Cologne in 1568, in place of the newly elected elector Salentin. From data of the year 1569 it is known that Gebhard led a scandalous life at Augsburg, and by request of Cardinal Otto, Duke Albert V interposed with exhortations which appear to have occasioned some improvement. In 1574 Gebhard became dean of the cathedral at Strasburg; in 1576, by papal nomination, provost of the cathedral at Augsburg. At all events, his ecclesiastical behavior must have been clear of suspicious imputations, and the curia was ready to confirm his election as elector of Cologne.

A personal matter drew the elector, some years after his election, into the ecclesiastical strife, and gave new life to the Bavarian hopes. Gebhard, about 1580, had formed a liaison with Countess Agnes of Mansfeld, a canoness of the cloister at Gerresheim. Under the insistencies of the dishonored woman's relatives, Gebhard resolved on marriage. Originally, no doubt, he meant to resign his office and renounce the spiritual career; but the same friends who had been active in securing his election now induced him to retain the archiepiscopal position despite his marriage. After somewhat prolonged, though not, indeed, by any means satisfactory preliminaries, and after formal conclusion thereof in the city of Bonn, which, for that matter, was anything but unanimously in accord with him, the elector publicly announced, in Dec., 1582, and in Jan., 1583, that he licensed the exercise of both confessions in the archdiocese, the old as well as the new; and that he himself intended to adopt the Augsburg Confession, to remain archbishop, and to marry. Gebhard's short-sightedness betrays itself in the fact that on publicly declaring his purpose he still had no assurance that he had sufficient support in the archdiocese, or that he would receive encouragement from the German Protestants or from Orange and the States-General. Up to that time, only the counts of Wetterau and Palgrave John Casimir had showed themselves ready to help. In case a general Protestant support were lacking—and this was just what happened, thanks to the mistaken policy of Elector Augustus of Saxony—the unsuccessful issue of this attempt toward religious freedom was inevitable from the outset.

4. Gebhard's Downfall.

Even before Gebhard had publicly announced his purposes, his adversaries were stirring (from the autumn of 1582); the cathedral chapter at Cologne, opposing on both ecclesiastical and personal grounds the secularization of the archdiocese, devised measures of resistance, and formed an alliance with the governor-general of the Netherlands, Alexander of Parma; moreover the territorial estates of the diocese declared themselves against Gebhard's project. The most influential member of the chapter, the suffragan bishop, Duke Frederick of Saxe-Lauenburg, even began, on his own responsibility, open war against the innovation. The city of Cologne arrayed itself against the elector; the Emperor charged him to desist; and the curia instituted canonical procedure against all apostates. In Apr. 1583, Gebhard was excommunicated and deposed from his rank. Bavarian statecraft now began to stir anew, and the curia, no less than Gebhard's antagonists in the chapter at Cologne, accepted Duke Ernest as their sole possible candidate. He had appeared in Cologne at the beginning of March, and at the new election, duly appointed under date of May 23, he was unanimously elected archbishop. Ernest and Gebhard now confronted each other as champions of different principles no less than as exponents of personal interests; nor was Gebhard disposed to recede. Promptly after his election, Ernest, supported by his brother Duke William V., by the Spanish Government at Brussels, and by the curia, collected an army; his elder brother, Duke Ferdinand of Bavaria, was appointed commander-in-chief, in the summer of 1583; and Spanish regiments were furthermore in readiness to cooperate, since it would be a new menace to the shattered Spanish dominion in the Netherlands if the electorate of Cologne fell into Protestant hands. Gebhard's military forces were quite unequal to this opposition. Among the archdiocesan subjects, only the estates of the duchy of Westphalia had declared in his favor; in the Rhenish districts of the electorate, Gebhard, at the beginning of the war, had only a few secure points in his hand (Bonn, Bedbur, Berk, and Uerdingen); in the southern portion of the diocese, his brother Karl Truchsess fought on his side and in the north his most capable partizan, Count Adolphus of Neuenar, but both with meager commands. Palgrave John Casimir, to be sure, the sole Protestant prince who attempted to furnish real assistance, marched up to his support with seven thousand men in the summer of 1583; but his army, unfit to begin with, and by no means well handled under his own leadership, was well-nigh ready to disband after two months of fruitless maneuvering on the right bank of the Rhine, and in consequence of a shortage of pay. In October John Casimir was recalled from the seat of war to Heidelberg, to assume the regency on occasion of the death of his brother, Elector Louis. The ban of the Empire, threatened by the emperor, contributed to the collapse of this auxiliary service. Negotiations with the States-General leading to no result, Gebhard was left to his own resources for facing the much stronger adversary. In spite of

this, half a year elapsed before the new elector's preponderating power achieved its purpose; first in the archdiocese, then also in Westphalia, one city and one castle after another slowly succumbed. Gebhard sought refuge in the Netherlands, and finally died at Strasburg in 1601. The battle over the electoral dignity and religious freedom was decided from 1584; by admission to the electoral college early in 1585, Ernest won for himself the legal recognition of the Empire.

Gebhard was impelled by no great idea, nor could he claim through virile activity the title to high striving ambition. He meant well, both at the outset as Roman Catholic and later as Protestant, but was wanting in depth and tenacity. His victorious adversary, personally, was not at all his superior. Ernest had pretty nearly the same good and evil traits, and lived a spiritual life just as little as his predecessor; "he is a great sinner, but you must cut your cloth to the figure," was the papal nuncio's remark of him. Again, Ernest's personality was almost indifferent as regards the result; he was carried to his position by the rising tide of the Counterreformation. Over Gebhard, who stood alone, the victory was the curia's, Bavaria's, and Spain's.

Now that the political task was accomplished, the ecclesiastical forces of the Counterreformation began to exert themselves; the Jesuits and the papal nuncios proceeded to invest their field. In the Rhenish districts of the diocese and in Westphalia, Protestantism was combated energetically; by the acquisition of Münster, where Ernest was elected in 1585, and by the induction, under Bavarian influence, of trustworthy Roman Catholics into the episcopal sees of Osnabrück, Paderborn, and Minden, the possibility of a consolidated Roman Catholic Northwestern Germany appeared to be once again in the course of realization. However, the Protestant congregations everywhere struggled obstinately for their existence; in spite of all repression, they continually increased in Cologne toward the close of the sixteenth century; while the greatest obstacles to a complete reaction in the electorate at large inhered in the elector's personality. His worldly inclinations were so little amenable to the desires of the curia that even by 1588 the papal nuncio agitated the plan of a coadjutorship. When the administration and the finances fell into worse and worse decline, and the elector by his ardor for the chase and his worldly dress, his evasion of the commandments of the Church, and his frivolous life caused sharper and sharper vexation, the installation of a coadjutor was prosecuted with earnestness. In Apr., 1595, with the elector's consent, his nephew Duke Ferdinand of Bavaria was elected to that office. The liquidation of accumulated debts was now undertaken, and a visitation, with ecclesiastical reforms, of the entire archdiocese was accomplished.

5. Progress of the Counter-reformation.

But even though the electorate of Cologne and the neighboring episcopal provinces were securely annexed once more to the Roman Church, the attempt again to subject to the Roman Church the entire Northwest of Germany did not succeed; for not only did the Netherland provinces, victorious in their battle with Spain, form a strong Protestant counterpoise, but also in the Juliers-Cleves districts, the Protestant congregations maintained themselves notwithstanding limitations; indeed, they continually increased, insomuch that in Cleves and in the Mark they actually held the preponderance, and in 1609, when Brandenburg and Pfalz-Neuburg assumed possession of the territories of the house of Juliers, the time of complete liberty was at hand for them.

WALTER GOETZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. Ennen, *Geschichte der Stadt Köln*, vol. v., Cologne, 1880; M. Lossen, *Der kölnische Krieg*. Gotha, 1882; M. Philippson, *La Contre-Révolution religieuse au xvi. siècle*, Brussels, 1884; L. Keller, *Die Gegenreformation in Westfalen*, vol. ii., Leipsic, 1887; Unkel, in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, vols. viii., x., Munich, 1887, 1889; J. Hansen, *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, vol. iii., parts 1–2, Gotha, 1892–94; idem, *Rheinische Akten zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens, 1542–82*, ib. 1896; G. Wolf, *Aus Kurköln im 16. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1905.

GEBHARDT, OSKAR LEOPOLD VON: German Lutheran; b. at Wesenberg (150 m. s.e. of St. Petersburg) June 22, 1844; d. at Leipsic May 10, 1906. He studied at Dorpat, Tübingen, Göttingen, and Leipsic and was assistant in the library of Leipsic University 1875–76, custodian and sublibrarian of the University of Halle 1876–80, librarian of the University of Göttingen 1880–84, librarian of the Royal Library, Berlin, 1884–91, and divisional director of the same institution 1891–93. From 1893 until his death he was director of the library of the University of Leipsic. He wrote or edited *Græcus Venetus* (Leipsic, 1875); *Patrum Apostolicorum opera* (3 vols., 1875–77, in collaboration with A. Harnack and T. Zahn; editio minor, 1877); *Evangeliorum codex Græcus purpureus Rossanensis* (1880; in collaboration with A. Harnack); *Das Neue Testament griechisch nach Tischendorfs letzer Recension und deutsch nach dem revidierten Luthertext* (1881); *Novum Testamentum Græce, recensionis Tischendorfianæ ultimæ textus cum Tregellesiano et Wescottiano-Hortiano collatus* (1881); *The Miniatures of the Ashburnam Pentateuch* (London, 1883); and *Acta martyrum selecta* (Berlin, 1902). He was likewise the editor of the eleventh to the sixteenth edition of W Theile's *Novum Testamentum Græce* (Leipsic, 1875–1900), while with A. Harnack he established and edited the valuable *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (1882 sqq.), to which he himself contributed a number of monographs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A memorial sketch is found in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, June, 1906.

GEDALIAH, ged"ą-laı'ą: Son of Ahikam and grandson of Shaphan, and protector of Jeremiah from the people who sought to kill him because of his predictions against Jerusalem (Jer. xl. 5–8, xliii. 6). He was appointed by Nebuchadrezzar governor of Judea after the fall of Jerusalem, in accordance with the custom of Eastern monarchs to leave the government of subjected lands in charge of distinguished individuals of the conquered races. The selection of Gedaliah for this position may have

been determined by his attitude toward the rebellion, which made him appear trustworthy to the Babylonian overlord. It may have been through Gedaliah that Nebuchadrezzar gave directions for the protection of the prophet (Jer. xxxix. 11 sqq.), and that he was released from bonds and given his full liberty by Nebuzaradan, the Babylonian general (Jer. xl. 1–6). Gedaliah fixed his residence at Mizpah, whither Jeremiah came, and also the representatives of the Jewish insurgents in order to get advice of Gedaliah. His counsel was to live quietly, since then they would be unmolested by the Babylonians. The result was that the Jews who had been fugitives among the neighboring peoples returned and placed themselves under Gedaliah's protection, and the nucleus of a new Jewish nation was gathered. But there was an element in the population which regarded subjection and even a peaceful life under the Chaldeans as disgraceful, and these were led by Ishmael, one of the princes royal. He was prompted by Baalis, king of Ammon, to kill Gedaliah. The governor was warned of the plot by a certain Johanan, who offered to forestall its execution by the assassination of Ishmael. Gedaliah regarded the information as a slander and rejected the offer. Three months after the fall of the city, Ishmael with ten companions visited Gedaliah, was entertained by him, and then slew him and the Jews and Chaldeans who were of his company (Jer. xli. 1–3). Ishmael slew also on the second day after a number of men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria who were bringing gifts for the Temple, carried off as prisoners the residents of Mizpah, and started on his journey to Ammon. He was confronted on the way by Johanan with a strong force, and was compelled to abandon his prisoners and escape with a small band to the Ammonites. (W. Lotz.)

Bibliography: The works on the history of the period mentioned under Ahab; and Israel, History of, especially Stade, i. 696–700, Kittel, p. 33, and Kent, *The Divided Kingdom.*

GEDDES, ged'ez, ALEXANDER: Scottish Roman Catholic; b. near Rathven (50 m. n.w. of Aberdeen), Banffshire, Sept. 14, 1737; d. in London Feb. 26, 1802. He studied at the Roman Catholic seminary at Scalan (1751–58) and at the Scotch College in Paris (1758–64). On his return to Scotland he officiated as priest in the region of Angus. In 1765 he became chaplain to the earl of Traquair, and in 1769 pastor of the Roman Catholic congregation at Auchinhalrig, but was deprived of his charge in 1779 for attending a Presbyterian service. In 1780 he settled in London, where he devoted himself almost entirely to authorship, preaching only occasionally. He published several volumes of verse, including a translation of the first book of Homer's Iliad (London, 1792), but his chief works are his translation of the Old Testament (2 vols., London, 1792–97), complete through Chronicles; and his *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures* (1800). He adopted the German method of rationalizing the Biblical narrative, thereby incurring the displeasure of both Protestants and Roman Catholics. In 1800 he was suspended from all ecclesiastical functions, and his translation of the Bible was prohibited to the faithful. His unfinished translation of the Psalms was edited by John Disney and Charles Butler and completed from Geddes' corrections in Bishop Wilson's Bible (London, 1807). When Geddes died, mass was prohibited over his remains. It was his misfortune to be in advance of his time, and he lacked tact in presenting his views; in some points he anticipated modern scholarship, and many of his critical remarks are excellent.

Bibliography: J. M. Good, *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, London, 1803; T. K. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 4–11, New York, 1893; C. A. Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, p. 282, New York, 1899, *DNB*, xxi. 98–101 (where scattered notices are indicated).

GEDDES, JENNY: According to the popular story, a Scottish "herb-woman" who instigated a riot in St. Giles's Church, Edinburgh, on Sunday, July 23, 1637 Archbishop Laud was trying to introduce the English liturgy into Scotland, and the attempt raised a storm of indignation. The dean of Edinburgh, however, made the experiment in the Cathedral Church of St. Giles, on the Sunday named, in the presence of the privy council and the city magistrates. According to the usual story, Jenny Geddes, hearing the archbishop direct the dean in finding the collect for the day, exclaimed in indignation, "Villain, dost thou say mass at my lug?" (ear), and hurled the stool upon which she had been sitting at the dean's head. This was the signal for a riot in and about the cathedral. The people shouted through the streets, "A pope, a pope! Antichrist! the sword of the Lord and of Gideon!" and the ultimate result was the withdrawal of the liturgy, since the outburst of popular feeling was by no means confined to Edinburgh. According to other accounts it was a woman named either Mein or Hamilton who threw the stool. The maiden name of Mrs. Mein or Mrs. Hamilton may have been Geddes, although the popular account represents Jenny Geddes as an old woman. Both Mrs. Mein and Mrs. Hamilton, moreover, are described as women of a social status far above that of Jenny Geddes. A herb-woman of the same name is said to have given her stall to be burned in a bonfire at the rejoicings in honor of the coronation of Charles II. Other accounts of the riot of 1637 state that the name of the woman who threw the stool was not known. A folding stool, the very one used by Jenny Geddes, it is said, is exhibited in the National Museum of Antiquities in Edinburgh.

Bibliography: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, vi. 150–152, 8 vols., London, 1873; Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 88; *DNB*, xxi. 102.

GEHENNA ("Valley of Hinnom"): Originally the name of the deep valley south of Jerusalem, later a name given to the place of torment. The full form of the name ("valley of the son of Hinnom") appears in II Kings xxiii. 10. Hinnom is otherwise unknown. From Old Testament references and from the accurate description of its position in Enoch xxvi. 1–5, it is identified with the present Wadi al-Rababah. At the end of the pre-exilic period Moloch-worship was carried on there, and Josiah desecrated the place (II Kings xxiii. 10)

but without permanent effect (Jer. vii. 31–32, xix. 2–6, xxxii. 35). Jeremiah announced that this valley was in future to be called "valley of slaughter," because the enemies were to kill there the fleeing inhabitants of Jerusalem and leave their bodies unburied (Jer. vii. 32, xix. 6). Isa. lxvi. 24 states that the carcasses of the men that transgressed shall in future be before the gates of Jerusalem for an amazement to every one because "their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." Dan. xii. 2 even goes beyond Isa. lxvi. 24, and is illustrated by the contemporaneous description in Enoch xc. 26–27, according to which after Israel's redemption an abyss filled with fire is to be opened south of Jerusalem, into which ungodly Israelites are to be thrown after submitting to judgment. According to Enoch xxvi. 1–xxvii. 3, this very valley of Ben-hinnom was conceived as the place of future judgment and punishment of impious Israelites. Thus it became customary to call the place of punishment of the Jewish wicked "valley of Hinnom." The name was retained after the idea of the place of punishment in the last day had severed itself from that locality and its connotation expanded to mean a place of punishment for all men. There is no trace that the name of the Ben-hinnom valley was transferred to the place of punishment after death, for according to Enoch xc. 24–25 besides the fiery abyss near Jerusalem there was a second fiery abyss, appointed for the fallen angels and the "shepherds of the nations." In the second prechristian century there comes into view a different fate of the pious and impious in the other world, which begins after death. Enoch xxii. 10 sqq. speaks of a twofold place for the impious in Hades. The Apocalypse of Baruch, xxxvi. 11, distinguishes between the (lesser) torment of the impious before the last judgment and the greater after it. The place of the former is called Gehenna (xlix. 10). According to IV Ezra vii. 80–87, the ungodly dead are in a restless state of anxious expectation of coming torment; according to vii. 36, the lake of torment and the oven of Gehenna become manifest only at the end. According to Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII., i. 3; *War*, II., viii. 14), the Pharisees made the everlasting punishment of the ungodly begin with their death. As to the locality of the place of punishment, different views prevailed. It was easiest to seek the place of the impious in Hades under the earth. This was the view of the Pharisees (Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII., i. 3) and of Josephus (*War*, III., viii. 5; cf. Enoch li. 1; Apocalypse of Baruch xxi. 24; IV Ezra vii. 32). According to Enoch xxii. (cf. xxi. 1, 2), this place lies outside of heaven and earth. The place of everlasting punishment after the last judgment was located by the Pharisees under the earth. In this case a connection between this place and the Ben-hinnom valley could easily be made by seeking in this valley one of the gates to hell. The old notion of the judgment-place in the Ben-hinnom valley near Jerusalem was never completely given up, only that the locality was differently fixed. The thoughts about the final fate of the ungodly can be understood from Israelitic assumptions, but there can be no doubt as to foreign influences, especially Greek.

In the Old Testament and Apocrypha.

In the New Testament the Grecized form of the word is found only in the synoptic Gospels and Jas. iii. 6. By "Gehenna of fire" (R. V., margin, Matt. v. 22, xviii. 9; Mark ix. 47?) this "valley" is more accurately designated. The fire is called "unquenchable" (Matt. iii. 12; Mark ix. 43; Luke iii. 17) and "everlasting" (Matt. xviii. 8, xxv. 41). It is placed in opposition to the "dominion of God" or "eternal life" and denotes the state which falls to the final lot of the ungodly, and this, according to Matt. x. 28, affects both soul and body. The fire is here to be taken literally, whereas "the outer darkness" (Matt. vi. 23, etc.) is figurative. The devil and his angels are appointed for the like death by fire according to Matt. xxv. 41, the demons according to Matt. viii. 29. The same idea of the final destiny of the ungodly is also found in Heb. x. 27 sqq., xii. 29, in Jude 7; and in Rev. xix. 20, xx. 10, 14; xxi. 8. Whereas it is supposed that death is the lot of both good and bad and the different lot of each can show itself only in events which do not occur at death, Paul taught that death is the wages of sin and therefore a passing anomaly for the righteous to which he must submit as being in the flesh, but that it is the lasting lot of the ungodly. The Gospel and Epistles of John speak indeed of a coming day of judgment (v. 29; I John iv. 17) for which the unrighteous "rise," but in xv. 6 a punishment of apostates with fire is mentioned figuratively only, so that it can not be stated how the literal statement would read.

In the New Testament.

(G. DALMAN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best single book covering the subject is R. H. Charles, *Critical Hist. of Doctrine of a Future Life*, London, 1899. For detailed study of the Jewish non-canonical ideas consult the literature under PSEUDEPIGRAPHA; A. Hilgenfeld, *Jüdische Apocalyptik*, Jena, 1857; A. Wünsche, *Die Vorstellungen vom Zustande der Seele nach dem Tode nach Apokryphen, Talmud und Kirchenvätern*, in *JPT*, vi (1880), 355–383; J. Hamburger, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ii. 1252–57, Strelitz, 1883; A. Löwy, in *PSBA*, x (1888), 333–342; D. Castelli, in *JQR*, i (1889), 314–352; T. K. Cheyne, *Origin and Religious Content of Psalter*, pp. 381–452, London, 1891; F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, pp. 142–147, 174–177, Giessen, 1892; R. Kabisch, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, Göttingen, 1893; E. Haupt, *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, Berlin, 1895; F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 341–344, Leipsic, 1897; E. Stave, *Ueber den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judenthum*, Harlem, 1898; P. Carus, *Hist. of the Devil*, Chicago, 1900; H. Guthe, *Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch*, pp. 271–274, Tübingen, 1903; *DB*, ii. 119–120; *JE*, v. 582–584. Ezra Abbot's *Literature of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, originally appended to W. R. Alger's *Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, but published separately, New York, 1871, is exhaustive for the earlier literature.

GEIBEL, gai'bl, **JOHANN:** German Reformed minister; b. at Hanau Apr. 1, 1776; d. at Lübeck July 25, 1853. He studied at Hanau and at Marburg and acted for some time as private tutor at Copenhagen. In 1797 he was called to Lübeck as vicar to Pastor Butendach, upon whose death, half a year later, he succeeded to the chief ministry, and served as such till 1847. As a preacher he was eloquent and convincing, and he exercised consid-

erable influence outside the Reformed congregation. With several prominent men of Lübeck he founded a Bible Society and a Missionary Association; and in his own house he held Bible lectures and discussions. In the interest of his congregation he published various catechetical works, but only a few of his sermons appeared in print. With the Hessian philosopher Suabedissen, Geibel established a school for his congregation which existed for six years. He also served his community by arranging (1824) the system of worship still in existence, and by the introduction (1832) of the first satisfactory hymn-book of modern times. Of his published works may be mentioned *Prüfet Alles und behaltet das Gute* (Hamburg, 1818), five sermons "in behalf of Evangelical liberty and truth"; and *Wiederherstellung der ersten christlichen Gemeinde, von Philalethes* (1840).

GEIGER, gai'ger, **ABRAHAM:** German Jewish scholar and theologian; b. at Frankfort May 24, 1810; d. at Berlin Oct. 23, 1874. He studied philosophy and Oriental languages at Heidelberg and Bonn and in 1832 became rabbi at Wiesbaden. In the interest of the reform movement in Judaism with other scholars, he established the *Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* in 1835. In 1838 he accepted a call to Breslau as associate rabbi, though he had to defend himself against the opposition of the orthodox party. Here he founded in 1862 the *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* (11 vols., Breslau, 1862–74), which was written almost entirely by himself. He was rabbi at Frankfort from 1863 to 1870, when he became rabbi at Berlin and professor in the newly established "Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums." Geiger was one of the pioneers of the reform of Judaism, insisting upon a liberal interpretation in the construction and observance of the traditional Jewish law. Of his numerous writings the most important are: *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen?* (Bonn, 1833; new ed., Leipsic, 1902), a prize essay on the Jewish sources of the Koran; *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwickelung des Judentums* (Breslau, 1857); *Die Sadducäer und Pharisäer* (1863); and *Das Judentum und seine Geschichte* (3 vols., 1864–71; Eng. transl., *Judaism and its History*, vol. i., New York and London, 1866). His son Ludwig Geiger edited his *Nachgelassene Schriften* (5 vols., Berlin, 1875–78).

Bibliography: A memoir by his son Ludwig, *A. Geiger, Leben und Briefe*, is in the *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. v., ut sup.; E. Schreiber, *A. Geiger als Reformator des Judenthums*, Löbau, 1880; *JE*, v. 584–587.

GEIGER, FRANZ TIBURTIUS: Roman Catholic; b. at Harting, near Regensburg, May 16, 1755; d. at Lucerne May 8, 1843. He studied under the Jesuits in Regensburg and the Benedictines at St. Emmeran. In 1772 he became a novice in the Franciscan order at Lucerne. The next year he returned to Regensburg and he studied theology in Würzburg. He was successively teacher of Hebrew in Regensburg, privat-docent of poetry and rhetoric in Offenburg, professor of philosophy at Freiburg in Switzerland, and cathedral preacher and professor of theology in the school of his order at Solothurn. In 1792 he was appointed professor of theology at Lucerne, the seat of the papal nuncio, and the center of Roman Catholic Switzerland. He was opposed here on account of his original method, which was not in sympathy with scholasticism, and because in the doctrine of grace he did not follow the Jesuits. He was even accused in Rome, but the papal court took care to keep so efficient a worker.

As *Theologus nuntiaturæ* he rendered important services to the Roman Catholic Church. He directed far-reaching ultramontanist plans and stood in connection with the most important leaders of the party. In his doctrines, sermons, negotiations, and treatises he concentrated all his energies to enliven the Roman consciousness, to make Switzerland the bulwark of ultramontanism, and to frustrate the efforts of political and religious liberalism. "Without pope, no Church" was for him as much an axiom as "Without revelation, no religion." He attacked freemasonry especially, and in 1819 his opponents succeeded in removing him from his chair, thereby making him a martyr and increasing his influence. His numerous polemical treatises, notwithstanding the effect they produced, have no scholarly value. (Emil Egli.)

Bibliography: The works of Geiger were collected and published by Prof. Widmer, 8 vols., Lucerne, 1824–39. who published also *Franz Geiger, . Laute aus seinem Leben*, ib. 1843. Consult also *KL*, v. 186–188.

GEIKIE, gî''kî', **JOHN CUNNINGHAM:** Church of England; b. at Edinburgh Oct. 26, 1824; d. at Bournemouth (25 m. s.w. of Southampton), Hampshire, Apr. 1, 1906. He studied at Queen's College, Toronto, and was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry in 1848. He was pastor of the Argyle Street Presbyterian Church, Halifax, N. S., 1851–1854, of the Argyle Street Chapel, Sunderland, England, 1860–67, and of Islington Chapel, London, 1867–73. He then entered the Church of England and was ordered deacon in 1876 and ordained priest in 1877. He was curate of St. Peter's, Dulwich, 1876–79, rector of Christ's Church, Neuilly, Paris, 1879–81, vicar of St. Mary's, Barnstaple, 1882–85, and vicar of St. Martin-at-Palace, Norwich, 1885–90. In 1890 he retired from the active service of the Church. In theology he adhered to the Evangelical school of the Church of England, but maintained the right to full investigation of all religious problems. He wrote *George Stanley: or, Life in the Woods* (London, 1864); *Life: A Book for a Quiet Hour* (1868); *Light from Beyond to Cheer the Christian Pilgrim* (1872); *The Life and Words of Christ* (1877); *Old Testament Portraits* (1878); *The English Reformation* (1879), *Entering on Life* (1879); *Hours with the Bible* (12 vols., 1880–1897); *The Holy Land and the Bible* (1887); *Short Life of Christ for Old and Young* (1888); *Landmarks of Old Testament History* (1895), and *The Vicar and his Friends* (1901).

GEIL, WILLIAM EDGAR: Baptist layman; b. near Doylestown, Pa., Oct. 1, 1865. He was graduated at Lafayette College in 1890 and in 1896 spent six months in an archeological tour of Asia

Minor. Between 1901 and 1905 be traveled extensively for a comparative cthnographical and missionary study of native races, and penetrated deeply into China and Africa. He has lectured in many lands on religious, historical, and scientific topics. He has written *Pocket Sword* (London, 1895); *Laodicea* (1898); *The Isle That Is Called Patmos* (Philadelphia, 1898); *Ocean and Isle* (Melbourne, 1902); *A Yankee on the Yangtze* (New York, 1904); *The Man of Galilee* (London, 1904); *A Yankee in Pigmyland* (New York, 1905); *The Men on the Mount* (London, 1905); and *The Automatic Calf* (1905).

GEILER, gai'ler, **JOHANN, OF KAISERSBERG:** Roman Catholic preacher; b. at Schaffhausen Mar. 16, 1445; d. at Strasburg Mar. 10, 1510. He was educated in the elementary branches at Ammersweier, a small town in the neighborhood of Kaisersberg in Upper Alsace, where his father was town secretary. At the age of fifteen he entered the University of Freiburg. In 1462 he was made bachelor and two years later master of arts. As such he lectured on Aristotle and Latin grammar, and for a short time was dean of the philosophical faculty. In 1471 he went to Basel to study theology. After promotion he lectured on exegesis and Peter Lombard and, in 1475, was made doctor of theology. At the request of students the town council of Freiburg induced him to return to the university there, and according to custom he became first rector of the university for the winter term of 1476–77. But his talents inclined him toward the office of preacher, and Peter Schott, Ammeister of Strasburg, prevailed upon him to settle there, where there was a lack of good preachers. With the firm determination to reform the depraved morals of the city, he entered upon his calling (1478) and remained at Strasburg until the end of his life.

His Life.

He preached fearlessly and without regard of persons. At the opening of a synod convoked by Bishop Albert he censured the assembled officers for their selfishness and worldliness and demanded a reform of morals among the clergy. In the interest of the Church he fell into several disputes with the magistrates on account of their refusal to grant the Holy Communion and a Christian funeral to persons condemned to death; he also made war against the tendency of civil legislators to encroach upon the liberty of citizens who intended to bequeath their property to the Church. His vehement attacks were, however, often powerless and without effect. In the same way he denounced the abuses of church life, as, for instance, the carousals and debauches at church festivals, the masquerades at the beginning of Lent, the pursuit of worldly business during church hours, and the sales in the vestibules of the churches. In these battles he found an almost insuperable obstacle in the tenacity with which the people held to tradition and the lenient ways followed hitherto by the clergy. Sometimes his invectives against the city council in the pulpit were so violent that he was called to account; as an answer he published twenty-one articles which contained his demands of reform. With the same relentless vigor he reproved abuses among the ecclesiastical classes. Many, he knew, chose the clerical profession only because of their laziness. He deplored the accumulation of benefices and the preference given to noblemen irrespective of their merits. Not less fiercely he attacked the abuses in monasteries, the sins of the rich, the degeneration in army circles, luxury in dress, fads, and immorality. It is a mistake, however, to look upon Geiler as a precursor of the Reformation. His view of life centered in Catholicism and medievalism. In spite of his high esteem for the Bible he considered its explanation subject to the consensus of the theologians. Over against the awakening of humanism he remained a scholastic of the old school. He commended indulgences and good works for the achievement of salvation and regarded the saints as intercessors before God.

His Preaching and Reformatory Efforts.

When Count Frederick of Zollern, a devoted pupil and friend of Geiler, was chosen bishop of Augsburg, he invited his Strasburg friends, among them Geiler, to prepare him for his office. The eminent preacher accepted and preached in Augsburg several months until he was called back by his anxious congregation. Now he devoted himself entirely to the affairs of his own town. Together with his friend Jacob Wimpfeling he tried to reform the school system; but their efforts were not successful and Geiler, in spite of his appreciation as preacher, came at the end of his life to the conclusion that a general reform of Christianity was impossible. The only achievements possible, according to him, were isolated reforms on a small scale.

Most of the literature which is considered to-day as Geiler's production did not proceed directly from his pen. His sermons were either copied, and prepared for print, or sometimes he simply handed over his Latin notes, from which his sermons were reconstructed in German or these notes were used after his death. It will therefore always be a question how far his publications are authentic. Some of his editors are unknown; of those known may be mentioned Jacob Otther of Speyer; the physician Johann Adelphus Müling; Johann Pauli, the well-known author of the humorous collection *Schimpf und Ernst;* Heinrich Wessmer; and Peter Wickram. Geiler's sermons lasted usually one hour. He gave free range in the pulpit to his talents of popular oratory in the vernacular, and his spontaneous invention of anecdotes, comparisons, word plays, and proverbs give his sermons their charm. They are either sermons on the Gospel arranged in the form of homilies or consist of series which are grouped around one common picture. To the scholastics he owes his fondness for analyzing his material into divisions and subdivisions and his tendency to quote recognized authorities. His interest centers chiefly in the daily happenings of public and private life. Satire and humor are his principal weapons. He makes his sermons interesting by striking similes which some-

His Sermons.

times form the central point of a long series of sermons. But even when they border on the burlesque he is always in earnest. It is true he sometimes goes too far in his similes and allegories, but allegorizing was the fashion of his time and the taste of his hearers was not refined. He rendered a great service to the German language by using exclusively the vernacular in his sermons and not a mixture of Latin and German, as was the custom of his time.

(G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Geiler's *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. P. de Lorenzi (with omission of "offensive" passages), appeared in four volumes at Treves, 1881–83. The two early works on Geiler by J. Wimpfeling (1510) and B. Rhenanus (1513) are in J. A. von Riegger, *Amœnitates literariæ Friburgenses*, Ulm, 1755. Consult: L. Dacheux (Roman Catholic), *Un Réformateur catholique à la fin du xve. siècle*, Paris, 1876; C. Schmidt (Protestant), *Histoire littéraire de l'Alsace*, i. 335–461, Paris, 1879; *ADB*, viii. 509.

GELASIUS, je-lê'shî-us *or* gê''lā-si'ūs: The name of two popes.

Gelasius I.: Pope 492–496. He was a Roman by birth, and entered upon his administration as successor to Felix III. on Mar. 1, 492. The schism with Byzantium which had begun under Felix in 484, on occasion of the excommunication of the Patriarch Acacius of Constantinople for his encouragement of the Monophysite doctrine (see FELIX III.; MONOPHYSITES), continued under Gelasius. Nor was Gelasius on good terms with Odoacer, the eastern emperor's "governor," but he got on better with the Ostrogothic king Theodoric, who from 493 resided at Ravenna as king of Italy, and as yet refrained from encroachments upon the province of the Church. This reserve of the Arian was of the utmost moment for Gelasius, who set his heart on extending the rights of the Roman primacy. In his letters he claimed the right to receive appeals from all parts of the world, and he contested the admissibility of appeal to any other tribunal from a deliverance by the bishop of Rome. The pre-eminence of the see of Rome is guaranteed for him by Matt. xvi. 18; beside it, the churches of Alexandria and Antioch occupy second and third rank. He spurned with indignation the equality with the Roman bishop desired by the bishop of Constantinople, and he upheld with great energy against the Emperor Anastasius the independence of the spiritual power. Concerning the genuineness of the so-called *Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis* ascribed to Gelasius I. there has been much disputation, but the matter is to be decided affirmatively. It may be that a part derives from Pope Damasus, maybe the entire matter was recast by Hormisdas in the sixth century; but the main portion was probably proclaimed under Gelasius at a Roman synod in 496. The decree comprises: (1) a table of the writings of the Biblical Canon; (2) a discussion of the primacy of the Roman Church; (3) a list of the synods to be accepted as valid; (4) and (5) a catalogue of the writings accepted and rejected by the Roman Church. Gelasius furthermore composed sundry dogmatic and polemical treatises; the origin of the so-called *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* (ed. H. A. Wilson, Oxford, 1894) is debatable (see LITURGICS). Gelasius died Nov. 19, 496, and is accounted a "saint" by the Roman Catholic Church.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ* are in *MPL*, lix. 13–140, and one of them in *MGH*, *Epist.*, iii (1891), 32–33. Sources are in Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 83–95, 619–743; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 255, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 116–118. Consult: A. Roux, *Le Pape S. Gélase I.*, Paris, 1880 (on the life and writings); J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 159–214, Bonn, 1885; Zahn, *Kanon*, II., i. 259 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 616 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 282–291; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 348–349.

Gelasius II. (Giovanni da Gaeta): Pope 1118–1119. He was born at Gaeta, and, after receiving his education in the monastery of Monte Cassino, was drawn to the curia by Urban II., appointed chancellor, and also promoted to the rank of cardinal deacon. He loyally supported Paschal II. (q.v.) when this pope was taken captive by Henry V of Germany in 1111, and was sharply attacked by a portion of the college of Cardinals on account of the treaty he had concluded with the emperor in relation to investiture. After the death of Paschal II. Cardinal Giovanni was unanimously elected as his successor (Jan. 24, 1118), and he adopted the name of Gelasius II. The conclave was scarcely ended when he was taken captive by the Frangipani party, but was soon released. However, the news then reached him that Henry V., upon word that the papal election had occurred without his cooperation, was approaching in rapid marches. In the fear that a treaty similar to the one exacted of his predecessor might be forced upon him, Gelasius fled hurriedly to Gaeta, where, on Mar. 9 and 10, he was consecrated priest and bishop. Upon his declining the demands of Henry in regard to investiture, and when thereupon the latter induced the Romans to elect Mauritius Burdinus, archbishop of Braga, as antipope (Gregory VIII., q.v.), Gelasius decreed from Capua on Apr. 7 the ban of excommunication against the emperor and the schismatic pope. After Henry's departure from Rome, he returned thither himself, but was very soon compelled to leave the city anew to escape the Frangipani plots; he now turned to France. The contest with Henry V. was prosecuted with great energy in Germany by the pope's legate, Kuno of Præneste. Gelasius died at Cluny Jan. 18, 1119.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ* are in Bouquet, *Recueil*, xv. 223–228, the *Epistolæ et privilegia*, in *MPL*, clxiii. 487–514. The early *Vita* by Pandulfus Aletrinus is in *ASB*, May, 9–13, and *MPL*, clxiii. 475–484. Consult: J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iv. 271–277, Bonn, 1893; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 775 sqq.; G. Richter, *Annalen der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, III., ii. 603–607, Halle, 1898; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 141, 245; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv. 125–129; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 453–455.

GELASIUS OF CYZICUS: Greek church historian of the fifth century. He was the son of a presbyter at Cyzicus, and is known through his history of the First Council of Nicæa, which he composed in Bithynia about 475 for the purpose of combating Monophysite appeals to the *Nicænum*. The work, in three books, is largely a compilation from Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. The data not derived from these sources came from an original documentary collection,

a sort of protocol covering the transactions at Nicæa, which had formerly been in the possession of Bishop Dalmatius of Cyzicus (c. 410). These original documents seem to have possessed real historic value. The work was first edited, in Greek and Latin, by the Scotchman Robert Balfour (Paris, 1599), and since then it has been reprinted in all the large collections of councils (e.g., Mansi, *Concilia*, ii. 753–946; also *MPG*, lxxxv. 1179–1360).

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: C. H. Turner, in *JTS*, 1900, pp. 125–126; G. Loeschcke, *Das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzicenus*, Bonn, 1906; *DCB*, ii. 621–623.

GELLERT, gel'lert, **CHRISTIAN FUERCHTEGOTT:** German poet and writer; b. at Haynichen, in the Erzgebirge, Saxony, July 4, 1715; d. in Leipsic Dec. 13, 1769. He was the son of a clergyman. After obtaining his first instruction in the school of his native city and attending, from 1729, the Fürstenschule in Meissen, he went, in 1734, to Leipsic to study theology. Since a congenital timidity and bashfulness as well as pulmonary weakness did not permit him to become a preacher, after four years of study and two of private tutorship, he returned in 1741 to Leipsic. He gave lessons for his support and made his début as an author by the publication of his earliest fables and tales in the *Belustigungen des Verstandes und Witzes* for 1741. In 1744 he joined the faculty of the university as privat-docent and lectured on poetry and oratory. Nearly all his secular works belong to this period. Of his comedies the *Band* appeared in the *Belustigungen* in 1744, and *Sylvia* in 1745; the *Betschwester* and *Los in der Lotterie* in the *Bremer Beiträge* in 1745–46. In 1746 also appeared his novel *Leben der schwedischen Gräfin von G——*. In 1746 and 1748 appeared the first two books of his celebrated fables, which, with the addition of a third book, have been often reprinted and translated. In 1751, Gellert became professor extraordinary; the students flocked to hear his lectures on literature and morals, and his influence over them was great. Even a tendency to hypochondria, the result of physical suffering, did not in any way lessen his popularity. In spite of the recognition awarded him, he remained singularly modest; he declined the position of professor ordinarius as well as calls to Hamburg and Halle, preferring to remain in Leipsic.

Gellert's *Geistliche Oden und Lieder* met with general approval on their first appearance in 1757, and several were immediately introduced into new hymnals; they even found a warm reception with Roman Catholics. The secret of their influence lies decidedly in their strong religious tone in union with great ease and naturalness of expression. It is true that much may be said against them from an esthetic and dogmatic point of view; many are not suitable for hymns and some were called by Gellert himself "Biblical contemplations"; others, however, have a truly religious quality and a lyric strain, as, for example, the Christmas hymn, *Dies ist der Tag den Gott gemacht* ("This is the day which God has made"), and the Easter hymn, *Jesus lebt, mit ihm auch ich* ("Jesus lives and I live with him"). The pious subjectivity of the poet, which comes out in all his hymns, has found an echo in a thousand hearts and in this way has become truly objective. Gellert's hymns have been often republished and translated into foreign languages. His prose writings also, especially his lectures on morals and his shorter essays of an apologetic and parenetic character exerted a happy influence upon the religious thought of his time. They lack, however, the sharply defined ethical and dogmatic conceptions which are required to-day.

Gellert's works first appeared in ten parts, Leipsic, 1769–74; they have often been reprinted, the last time in Leipsic and Berlin, 1867 In the later editions are found a collection of letters from and to Gellert, but this does not include his letters to Fräulein Erdmuth von Schönfeld (issued as the first part of the *Dahlener Antiquarius*, Leipsic, 1861) or his diary of the year 1761 (ed. T. O. Weigel, 2d ed., Leipsic, 1863).

Carl Bertheau.

Bibliography: J. A. Cramer, *Gellert's Leben*, Leipsic, 1774; C. H. Schmid, *Nekrolog . . . der Deutschen*, ii. 481–532, Berlin, 1785; C. H. Jördens, *Lexikon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten*, ii. 54–88, vi. 140 sqq., Leipsic 1806–11; H. Döring, *Christian Fürchtegott Gellert's Leben*, Greiz, 1833; G. E. Leo, *Das fromme Leben Gellerts*, Dresden, 1846; H. Gelzer, *Die neuere deutsche National-Literatur*, i. 37–61, Leipsic, 1847; K. R. Hagenbach, *Die Kirchengeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, i. 339 sqq., Leipsic, 1848, Eng. transl., *Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, New York, 1869; *Das Gellertbuch*, ed. F. Naumann, Dresden, 1854; K. J. Nitzsch, *Ueber Lavater und Gellert*, Berlin, 1857; E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, vi. 263 sqq., Stuttgart, 1870; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, p. 285, New York, 1886; A. Schullerus, *Gellert's Leben und Werke*, Leipsic, 1894; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 406–408.

GELPKE, ERNST FRIEDRICH: German theologian; b. at Breitenfeld (4 m. n. of Leipsic) Apr. 8, 1807; d. at Bern Sept. 1, 1871. He studied at Grimma, Leipsic, and Berlin, in the latter university coming under the influence of Schleiermacher and Neander. His *Evangelische Dogmatik* (Bonn, 1834), written while he was a privat-docent at Bonn, gained him a call, in the year of its publication, to the newly founded university of Bern. There he lectured at first on New Testament exegesis, and later on dogmatics and moral theology, in addition to teaching in the gymnasia of the city. His chief work was his *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz* (2 vols., Bern, 1856–61), which, however, extends only to the eleventh century. In his theology Gelpke belonged to the mediating school, although his *Jugendgeschichte des Herrn* (1841) betrayed so strongly the influence of Strauss that it created a sensation at Bern. Humanistic idealism led him to join the freemasons, and he became grand master. Several of his poems were published, including his trilogy *Napoleon* (1854).

(E. Blösch†.)

Bibliography: Frau M. Bach-Gelpke, in *Sammlung bernischer Biographien*, i. 26 sqq., Bern, 1885; *ADB*, viii. 552.

GELZER, gelt'zer, **HEINRICH: 1.** German historian; b. at Schaffhausen Oct. 17, 1813; d. at his estate "Witwald" in the Jura Mountains, canton of Basel, Aug. 15, 1889. He was the son of an artisan, began the study of theology at Zurich, but on the advice of his physician, who considered his health not strong enough for the office of a preacher,

turned to history. He continued both theological and historical studies in Jena, Halle, and Göttingen where he was influenced especially by Hase, Tholuck, Otfried Müller, and Ewald. Returning to Switzerland, he became private tutor in Bern, and formed here an intimate friendship with K. J. von Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador. In 1839 he established himself as privat-docent at Basel. In 1843 he became professor extraordinary of the history of Switzerland and universal history; in 1844 he was called to Berlin as professor of history. Besides his activity as teacher, he was frequently consulted in political and educational problems. A severe illness compelled him to go to southern France and Italy, and after a time he settled at Basel and founded and edited the *Protestantische Monatsblätter für innere Zeitgeschichte* (1853–70), a periodical which attempted "to win the educated circles for the great moral-religious mission belonging to them, from the universal standpoint of genuine German Protestantism." At the same time, Gelzer was active in the spheres of secular and ecclesiastical politics. From the beginning of the sixties he was an intimate adviser of Grand duke Frederick of Baden. His theological standpoint was on the whole that of Rothe and Hundeshagen. As early as 1839, before the appearance of Rothe's "Ethics," Gelzer expressed the opinion that "perfect religion must be moral throughout and that perfect morality must be religious throughout." He demanded a theology that should go back to the leading ideas of a Herder, Fichte and Schleiermacher, without giving up the spiritual acquisition of romanticism and pietism, and in that way renew its conception of Christianity and Christian redemption.

Gelzer published among other works *Die drei letzten Jahrhunderte der Schweizergeschichte* (2 vols., Aarau, 1838–39), in which he treats in detail the religious conditions and history of morals beside political events; *Die Religion im Leben* (Zurich, 1839); *Die zwei ersten Jahrhunderte der Schweizergeschichte* (Basel, 1840); *Die neuere deutsche National-Litteratur nach ihren ethischen und religiösen Gesichtspunkten* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1847), his most popular work; *Protestantische Briefe aus Südfrankreich und Italien* (Zurich, 1852), the result of a journey to Italy. His *Dr. Martin Luther in geschichtlichen Umrissen* (Hamburg, 1847–51) appeared in several English translations, *The Life of Martin Luther in Fifty Pictures* (London, 1853; Philadelphia, 1855; London, 1858).

(Karl Gelzer.)

Bibliography: F. Curtius, *Heinrich Gelzer*, Gotha, 1892; R. Stähelin, in *Kirchenblatt für die reformirte Schweiz*, 1892.

2. German historian, son of the preceding; **b.** at Berlin July 1, 1847; d. at Jena in 1906. He studied in Basel and Göttingen, taught in a gymnasium in Basel 1869–73, and was appointed associate professor of ancient history in Heidelberg. After 1878 he was professor of classical philology and ancient history at Jena. Among his works those of special theological interest are *Patrum Nicænorum nomina Latine, Græce, Coptice, Syriace, Arabice, Armenice* in collaboration with A. Hilgenfeld and O. Cuntz (Leipsic, 1898); *Geistliches und Weltliches aus dem türkisch-griechischen Orient* (1900); *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der notitiæ episcopatum* (Munich, 1901); and *Vom heiligen Berge und aus Makedonien* (1905). He was also the editor of the series *Scriptores sacri et profani* (5 parts, Leipsic, 1897–1903).

GEMARA. See Talmud.

GEMISTOS PLETHON, GEORGIOS: Byzantine philosopher; b. at Constantinople c. 1355; d. in the Peloponnesus 1450. His early years were spent at the court of Sultan Murad I. at Adrianople and Brescia. There he was a pupil of the rationalistic Jew Elissæus, who inspired him with anti-Christian views, so that he later assumed the name of Pletho, in an attempt to approximate his ideal Plato. From the Turkish court Gemistos went to Sparta, where, with a few interruptions, he spent the remainder of his life as teacher, author, and statesman. He was on intimate terms with the despots of the Peloponnesus, one of whom, Theodore the Younger, bestowed certain estates upon him. As a member of the imperial council he attended the Council of Florence (see Ferrara-Florence, Council of) in the interests of a union of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, and there advocated the cause of orthodoxy for political reasons. There too he strengthened the bond with the philosophical representatives of the Italian Renaissance.

Gemistos can scarcely be regarded as a theologian. He was a modern pagan, deeply influenced by Neoplatonism and devoid of sympathy with Christianity. He was one of the protagonists of Platonism in its struggle with Aristotelianism, and at his suggestion Cosmo de' Medici drew up the scheme of a Platonic academy in Florence. The decline of the Greek Church and the conquest of the Roman Catholic Church by the Renaissance led him to see no hope for the future save in a return to classic paganism with the Neoplatonistic coloring which his ideals postulated. In his view, the *summum bonum* lay in the knowledge of the all, to which reason and the sages of antiquity, such as Zoroaster, Plato, and the Neoplatonists, were the guides. The supreme god, the author of the all, bore the name of Zeus, and was absolute existence and absolute goodness. From him proceeded, in a manner not altogether clear, the gods of the second rank, the world of ideas, comprised under the name of Poseidon. This differentiation of concepts continues in an analogous manner, always under a mythological terminology, until the phenomenal world is reached. Man shares in ideas and matter, and his soul is eternal, preexistent, and immortal, and is perfected by transmigration through various human bodies. Final blessedness is gained through the virtues of which Gemistos gives a detailed scheme, of which the chief are thought and the contemplation of deity. The religion of his ideal state was to be conducted by priests, who were to be required on certain days to hold services consisting of the recitation of prayers and the singing of hymns with symbolic ceremonies, all of which were detailed by Gemistos in full.

The concepts of Plethon are contained chiefly in his "Laws," which were first edited by C. Alexandre (Paris, 1858). His theological works are of minor importance, although they include a treatise on the procession of the Holy Ghost.

(PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Most of the works of Gemistos are in *MPG*, CXXX. Consult: W Gass, *Gennadios und Pletho*, Breslau, 1844; F. Schultze, *Geschichte der Philosophie der Renaissance*, vol. i., *Georgios Gemistos Plethon*, Jena, 1874; H. F. Tozer, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vii (1886), 353-380; J. Dräseke, in *ZKG*, xix (1898), 265-292; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 121, 429 et passim.

GENERAL CONFESSION: The name given to a public and general confession of sins made by the clergyman for the congregation, to distinguish it from auricular and private confession. It is of South German origin and goes back probably to the time of Charlemagne. It was spoken in German after the sermon (also in German) and was followed by the absolution and confession of faith and the Lord's Prayer. The earliest testimony to the usage dates from the ninth century; then there are a number of confessional prayers of this sort of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (cf. Hauck, *KD*, ii. 255, 729). The priest or deacon pronounced the confession, the people repeated it silently kneeling, and then the priest gave the absolution. The forms vary, but in time a certain formula seems to have developed. The first person singular was used, thus corresponding to private confession.

The Reformation found the general confession in common use, and the question whether it should be retained occasioned some controversy. It was solved differently in different places. In South and West Germany under influence of the Reformed Churches it was put at the beginning of the service,—a custom which had medieval precedent. Zwingli retained it in Zurich after the sermon. Calvin adopted for Geneva a custom already established in Strasburg of beginning service with a general confession repeated kneeling and using it at the daily "morning prayer." At present it is little used. [The Anglican service has a general confession said by the minister and congregation at morning and evening prayer and the communion service.] See CONFESSION OF SINS. (P. DREWS.)

In Roman Catholic theology and practise the term "general confession" is used to designate a confession in which the penitent makes a review, confessing the sins of his entire life even though they have already been declared in previous confessions. This is obligatory whenever the foregoing confessions either through insincerity or for any other reason have been invalid; otherwise it is a matter of counsel or spiritual direction. The name is also applied, though less strictly, to confessions which cover a given period, say a few years, by way of recapitulation, as distinguished from the ordinary weekly or monthly confession in which sins previously declared are not repeated. (J. F DRISCOLL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt*, pp. 220-221, Detmar, 1879; G. Rietschel, in *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, i (1896-97), 396 sqq.; idem, *Glossen zu der Ordnung des Hauptgottesdienstes*, pp. 31 sqq., Leipsic, 1898; idem, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, i. 369 sqq., 429 sqq., Berlin, 1898; E C. Achelis, *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie*, i. 389 sqq., Leipsic, 1898; and literature under COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF.

GENESIS. See HEXATEUCH.

GENESIS, LITTLE (*Leptogenesis*): Another name for the Book of Jubilees; see PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, IV. 33.

GENEVA: A city of Switzerland, of considerable importance in ecclesiastical history, with a population (1900) of 105,710. It was founded by the Allobroges, and employed by Cæsar as headquarters in his campaign against the Helvetii. At the beginning of the fifth century it came under Burgundian rule and was the residence of King Chilperic; but before this Christianity had taken firm root in the district. The establishment of the bishopric, which Leo the Great in 450 declared subject to the metropolitan of Vienne, is usually placed in the middle of the fourth century. When the death of the last Burgundian king, Rudolf III., in 1032 transferred Geneva to the Empire, the bishops acquired princely rights which led to frequent contests with the counts of Geneva during the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Bishop William of Conflans (1287-95) sought aid from Amadeus V. of Savoy, which was the beginning of gradual encroachments on the part of the latter power, and ultimately, through the necessity of forming an alliance in 1478 with Bern and Freiburg, of the Bernese influence which made the Reformation successful in Geneva. In 1534 its adherents, augmented by fugitives from France, were estimated to be equally numerous with those of the old religion. The bishop, Pierre de la Baume (1523-44), left the city, transferring his see first to Gex (1534) and then to Annecy (1535). In the latter year the senate abolished the bishopric; but the bishops, of whom the most distinguished was St. Francis of Sales (q.v.), continued to rule from Annecy those of their former subjects who still acknowledged their allegiance until 1802, when the French Revolution put an end to the see. The Congress of Vienna, restoring the canton to Switzerland, decreed religious equality; and in 1819 Pius VII. placed the Roman Catholics of Geneva (who formed a third of the population) under the bishop of Lausanne, allowing him two years later to add to his title that of the ancient see. When, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, for the first time in three hundred years, mass was celebrated in the city, there were not more than 300 Roman Catholics there; at present they number over 30,000 in spite of the repressive measures undertaken by the cantonal government after the Vatican Council of 1870, which included the repudiation and banishment of the vicar apostolic named by the pope and the requirement of an oath of allegiance to the government incompatible with Roman Catholic belief (law of Mar. 23, 1873). An Old Catholic congregation was established by the French ex-Carmelite Hyacinthe Loyson; the churches were one by one handed over to this organization, which in 1904 had ten congregations in Geneva.

The first seeds of the Reformation were sown here as early as 1524 with the importation of the French

translation of the Bible by Lefèvre d'Étaples; and in Dec., 1526, the Duke of Savoy asked for assistance from Rome in repressing the movement, while in 1528 he executed twelve gentlemen guilty "of possessing the accursed book and spreading the heresy of Luther." His efforts, however, were frustrated by the support which the Protestant cause received from Bern. In 1532 Farel arrived in Geneva and made a deep impression. Riots and combats followed, in spite of the efforts of the Council of Two Hundred to reestablish peace by a compromise ordinance (Mar. 30, 1533). In July the bishop fled, never to return, but gained military support and from the middle of 1534 to the end of 1535 threatened the city. It succeeded in beating off these attacks at last, and on Apr. 2, 1536, the mass was finally abolished. In May a general assembly of the whole people swore to be at one in the sacred law of the Gospel. There were now ten pastors, who found their hands full and appealed for assistance. In July Calvin took up his residence there, and Geneva became a city governed by Protestant laws and a refuge for Reformers from France, Italy, Spain, and England (see CALVIN, JOHN). The city was the headquarters for Evangelical missionary effort; between 1555 and 1564 not less than 150 preachers left Geneva for France. In 1589 the party of the Guises in France allied itself with the Duke of Savoy in an attempt to recover the city by force. The war lasted until 1601, costing the republic 400,000 crowns and 1,500 lives, and was terminated by the Treaty of Lyons. The position of Geneva was made still stronger the next year by the victory of the Escalade, when on Dec. 11–12, 1602, an army of 8,000 men was despatched by Charles Emmanuel of Savoy to seize the city and had fixed their scaling-ladders to the walls before the alarm was given. The Genevese repelled the enemy and completed their success by turning the defeat into a rout. In the earlier part of the seventeenth century Geneva still continued to furnish pastors and teachers for France, and at its close became once more an asylum for Huguenot fugitives after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; between 1682 and 1720 3,600 refugees were received and maintained at the cost of the citizens. Close relations were also kept up with the Protestant churches of the North, England, Holland, and parts of Germany. In the eighteenth century, after two hundred years of constant combat with the papacy, Geneva was active in defense of the Christian faith against the attacks of Voltaire and the position of the Encyclopedist school in general: but the deism of Rousseau made alarming inroads on the Protestant Church membership. Between 1841 and 1878 there were constant conflicts between the Calvinist majority and the growing Roman Catholic minority, which resulted in the separation of Church and State.

The organization of the Church of Geneva remained unaltered for a long time, or underwent only minor modifications, until, in 1846, a radical change was effected, amounting almost to a revolution. Up to 1846 the pastors were chosen by the Vénérable Compagnie des Pasteurs, one of the institutions of Calvin, which also had in hand the administration of all religious affairs of the Church, and exercised great influence on the academy and the schools. But from that year the authority of the Compagnie was confined to questions of worship proper; while the other branches of the administration of the Church were placed under the consistoire, composed of twenty-five lay members and six pastors, and elected by the people; and the pastors were chosen by the congregations. At the same time that doctrinal difference began to develop which finally led to the formation of the Evangelical Society, and the foundation of a new theological school; for which see GAUSSEN; MERLE D'AUBIGNE; and EVANGELICAL SOCIETY OF GENEVA. The radicals, who gained control in 1846, held it for fifteen years, abolished the Protestant Church of Geneva, and established a church almost creedless. This was reversed in 1862, when the conservatives came into power. In 1873 the grand council ousted all Roman Catholic priests who refused the oath of allegiance to the State; in 1876 the cathedral was given to the Old Catholics. In 1878 the expelled curés were permitted to return, and the separation of Church and State was accepted. In 1909 a monument to John Calvin was erected by general subscription.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Important are the *Mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, Geneva, 1840 sqq. Consult: Besson, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique . . . de Genève*, Nancy, 1759; J. Gaberel, *Hist. de l'église de Genève*, 3 vols., Geneva. 1853–1862; *Regeste Genevois des documents imprimés relatifs à l'histoire de la ville et du diocèse de Genève avant l'année 1312*, Geneva, 1866; J. B. G. Maliffe, *Genève historique et archéologique*, ib. 1868 (sumptuous); J. D. Blavignac, *Le Christianisme à Genève*, ib. 1872; idem, *Études sur Genève*, 2 vols., ib. 1872–74; idem, in *Mémoires et documents d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, vii. 20; E. Choisy, *La Théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin*, ib. 1897; E Doumergue, *La Genève calviniste*, Lausanne, 1905.

GENEVA BIBLE. See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., § 4; BIBLES, ANNOTATED, II., § 1.

GENEVA CATECHISM. See CALVIN, JOHN; CATECHISMS.

GENEVA, CONSENSUS OF (*Consensus Genevensis*): A document drawn up by Calvin for the purpose of uniting the Swiss Reformed churches with regard to the doctrine of predestination. It appeared at Geneva in 1552, having received the signatures of all the pastors of that city. But beyond Geneva it acquired no symbolical authority, and attempts to enlist the civil government in its favor created dissatisfaction and opposition in Bern, Basel, and Zurich.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The text is in Calvin's *Opera*, viii (1870), 249–366, and in H. A. Niemeyer, *Collectio confessionum*, pp. 218–310, Leipsic, 1840. For history and full references to literature consult Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 474–477, and the literature on CALVIN.

GENEVIEVE, jen″e-vîv′: The name of two saints of the Roman Catholic Church.

1. Genevieve, Patron Saint of Paris: b., according to tradition, at Nanterre (7 m. n.w. of Paris), perhaps in 422; d. at Paris Jan. 3, 512. She is mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Francorum*, iv. 1) as one of the saints venerated at Paris, and as buried in the basilica of the apostles Peter and Paul, built by Clovis I. and his queen. The Latin life of

St. Genevieve, said to date in its earliest form from 520, states that her parents were the Christians Severus and Gerontia, and describes the extraordinary piety of her childhood, together with her powers of prophecy and her ability to work miracles. In 429 Bishop Germanus of Auxerre (q.v.) is said to have dedicated her to the Lord when he visited Nanterre on his way to England to combat Pelagianism. When about fifteen, after the death of her parents, St. Genevieve went to Paris, where she took the veil. During the invasion of the Huns in 451, she is said to have prophesied their speedy defeat and to have averted the famine in Paris and the surrounding cities by miraculous gifts of bread. After her death her relics brought the basilica of Peter and Paul such fame by their miraculous power that the name was changed to that of Ste. Geneviève. Before the destruction of this church in the Norman occupation of 857, her relics were taken to Athis, but, after their return to Paris, a stately church was erected to her by Abbot Stephen of Tournay (1177–80), where her magnificent reliquary of gold and jewels, borne by four gigantic female figures, was preserved until it was destroyed during the French Revolution. It is generally admitted that at least the kernel of the tradition concerning St. Genevieve is authentic, the arguments of Krusch, the chief opponent of the historicity of the account, being refuted by Duchesne, Narbey, and others.

2. Genevieve, Palgravine of Brabant: This saint is apparently the product of a legend of the late Middle Ages. According to tradition, she was the wife of the Rhenish Palgrave Siegfried, who was supposed to have flourished in the eighth century; after successfully resisting the advances of one Golo during her husband's absence, she is said to have been committed by her would-be seducer to the charge of a servant, together with her newborn child, to be drowned. The servant, however, merely conducted her to a lonely spot, where she was miraculously sustained and later discovered by her husband while hunting. This form of the legend, preserved in Eymich's account, was amplified by the Jesuit De Cerisiers, who also wrote a tragedy on the theme. The tradition originally centered about the chapel of Frauenkirche near Maria-Laach (20 m. w.n.w. of Coblenz), which was believed to have been founded by the palgrave and crusader Siegfried (d. 1113). His wife, originally Gertrude, a countess of Nordheim with estates in Brabant, was transformed by legend into a Genevieve, and, as a Brabantine counterpart to Ste. Geneviève of Paris, seems to have been approximated to her in time, so that she was supposed to have lived in the days of Charles Martel. Numerous attempts have been made to maintain the historicity of the tradition, either in part, as by Kupp and Sauerborn, or in whole, as by Brower, who identifies the mythical Bishop Hidulf mentioned in the legend with the historical Archbishop Hillin of Treves (1152–69), and thus places the beginning of the story in the twelfth century. On the other hand, Baronius and the *ASB* deny the existence of a Brabantine St. Genevieve, while Zacher has sought unsuccessfully to interpret the legend mythologically by identifying Siegfried with Odin, Golo with Ullr, and the like. (O. Zöcklerâ€ .)

Bibliography: 1. The literature, mostly devotional, is voluminous. A well-selected list is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1331–32. The earliest (anonymous) *Vita* is best edited by B. Krusch in *MGH, Script. rer. Merov.*, iii (1896), 204–238, cf. Krusch in *NA*, xviii (1893), 11–50, xix (1894), 444–459. This *Vita*, with two others, also anonymous, and *Miracula* and *Revelatio*, is in *ASB*, Jan., i. 143–153. C. Kohler has edited a fourth in *Étude critique sur le texte de la Vie latine de S. Geneviève*, Paris, 1881, while the first is edited by C. Narbey, *Quel est le texte authentique de la Vie de S. Geneviève*, ib. 1884. Consult: L. S. Lé Nain de Tillemont, *Vie de S. Geneviève . . precedée d'une notice sur toutes les vies*, Paris, 1825; M. B. Saintyves, *Vie de S. Geneviève . .*, ib. 1846; C. Lefeuve, *Hist. de S. Geneviève*, ib. 1861; Z. Bédouet, *Le Pélerin de S. Geneviève*, ib. 1868; P. Féret, *L'Abbaye de S. Geneviève et la congrégation de France, precedée de la vie . .*, 2 vols., ib. 1883; Vidieu, *Sainte Geneviève*, ib. 1883; *DCB*, ii. 632–639.

2. The early life is by René de Cerisiers, *L'Innocence reconnue, ou vie de S. Geneviève de Brabant*, Paris, 1647. Consult: H. Sauerborn, *Geschichte der Pfalzgräfin Genovefa*, Regensburg, 1856; J. Zacher, *Die Historie von der Pfalzgräfin Genovefa*, Königsberg, 1860; B. Seuffert, *Die Legende von der Pfalzgräfin Genovefa*, Würzburg, 1877; B. Golz, *Pfalzgräfin Genovefa in der deutschen Dichtung*, Leipsic, 1897; *KL*, v. 297–301.

GENEVIEVE, SAINT, ORDERS OF: 1. The Canons of St. Genevieve (or of the Congregation of France, *Canonici regulares congregationis Gallicanæ*): A Roman Catholic congregation established in 1058 by the transfer of canons of St. Victor to the church of Ste. Geneviève in Paris. Among its earliest members was Peter Lombard, but it first received permanent fame and influence through its reformer and second founder Charles Faure, after 1614. By the time of his death thirty years later the congregation had gained fifteen monasteries, and such was its reputation for scholarship that the chancellor of the Sorbonne always belonged to it. The members were employed in educational and hospital work. In 1646 the canons of St. Genevieve were united with the older congregation of Val des Écoliers, and in the first half of the eighteenth century they had seventy-seven abbeys and twenty-eight priories. They were dissolved by the Revolution. Their library, which has been national property since 1790 and in 1850 was transferred from the old abbey to a new building (*Bibliothèque Ste. Geneviève*), formed the nucleus of one of the most important public libraries of Paris.

2. The Daughters of St. Genevieve (Miramiones, Daughters of the Holy Family): A congregation established for the care of the poor and the education of girls in 1636 by Francisque de Blosset (d. 1642), one of the most zealous coworkers with St. Vincent de Paul. Its rule was confirmed by the archbishop of Paris in 1658, and seven years later the congregation was united with an order established in 1660 by Marie Bonneau de Rubelle Beauharnois de Miramion, since which time the name Miramiones has been used. The congregation spread and prospered until the Revolution. At the Restoration it was revived as the *Sœurs de la Sainte Famille*, with a mother house at Besançon. There are also houses in Amiens, Lyons, Pezanas, Toulouse, and Villefranche. The sisters pass a novitiate of two years after which they are bound by simple vows. Their rule enjoins upon them

works of mercy, particularly the care of the sick and poor of their own sex and the gratuitous instruction of girls. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: 1. *La Vie du Charles Faure*, Paris, 1698: *Constitutiones canonicorum regularium congregationis Gallicanæ*, ib. 1676; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, i., p. xlvii., ii. 378 sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. 413–414; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 171–172.

2. The *Constitutions* were published at Paris, 1683. Consult: Abbé Choisi, *Vie de Madame de Miramion*, ib. 1706; Helyot, ut sup., viii. 222 sqq.; Heimbucher, ut sup., ii. 438–439; *KL*, v. 301–302.

GENNADIUS, jen″ê-dî′ʊs *or* gen″ā-dî′ūs: The name of two patriarchs of Constantinople.

Gennadius I.: Patriarch 458–471; died at Constantinople Aug. 25, 471. About the middle of the century he was presbyter and abbot of a monastery at Constantinople, wrote in opposition to the anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria, and was raised to the patriarchate by Leo the Thracian after the death of Anatolius. In the following year a synod held by him led him to issue an encyclical in which he sought to heal the schism caused by the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and also endeavored to reform certain ecclesiastical abuses. He likewise entered into negotiations with Pope Leo I. concerning the deposition of the Monophysite Patriarch Timotheus Ælurus of Alexandria in 460. According to Gennadius of Marseilles, he was famed for his learning and was the author of a commentary on the prophet Daniel as well as of numerous homilies, all of which are apparently lost.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The writings are in *MPG*, lxxxv. Consult: *ASB*, Aug., v. 148–155; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, p. 502, Freiburg, 1894; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, x. 343–346, 710–711; *DCB*, ii. 629–631.

Gennadius II. (Georgios Scholarios): Patriarch in the fifteenth century, was born at Constantinople about the beginning of the fifteenth century; d. at Seres (47 m. n.e. of Salonica), probably in 1468. He was one of the last representatives of Byzantine learning and one of the last pillars of the Greek Church in the period of its negotiations for union with the Roman Catholic Church and its subjection to Mohammedan rule. Of his life few details are known. After receiving a thorough education in philosophy, theology, and law in Constantinople, he was apparently a teacher of philosophy for a time, but was later appointed imperial judge by the Emperor John VII., who esteemed him highly. In this capacity he accompanied the Emperor and Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, to Ferrara and Florence in 1438–1439, where he thrice spoke as an earnest advocate of the union of the two Churches (see FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF). After his return, however, the opposition of the Greek people and clergy to the union made him a determined opponent of the movement, and from that time he ranked as the real head of the antiunion party in Constantinople, issuing a series of polemics against the Roman Catholic Church and the advocates of union. His attitude seems to have resulted in a break with the Byzantine court, so that, following an idea long cherished, he retired to the monastery of Pantocrator, became a monk, and exchanged his secular name for the monastic appellation Gennadius. After the capture of Constantinople, however, the Sultan Mohammed II. planned to restore the patriarchate, and the choice of the synod fell upon Gennadius, although he had never taken orders, and sought to decline the proffered honor. In the spring of 1454 he was consecrated by the metropolitan of Heraclea, but, since both the Church of St. Sophia and the palace of the patriarch were now in the hands of the Turks, he took up his residence successively in two monasteries of the city. In the latter he received a visit from the sultan, at whose request he wrote an outline of the most important truths of Christianity in twelve chapters, which he presented to Mohammed both in the Greek original and in a Turkish translation (Eng. transl., *The Confession of Gennadius Exhibited to Mahumet II.*, London [1585?]). A few years later, however, he found his position so difficult that he was forced to resign and again retired to a monastic life.

Gennadius was a most prolific writer. The number of his works has been estimated at over a hundred, but a complete list is impossible, since the majority exist only in manuscript, others have been printed only in part, and others still are of doubtful authenticity. They may be classified, so far as known, into philosophical (interpretations of Aristotle, Porphyry, and others, translations of Petrus Hispanus and Thomas Aquinas, and defenses of Aristotelianism against the recrudescence of Neoplatonism) and theological and ecclesiastical (partly concerning the union and partly defending Christianity against Mohammedans, Jews, and paganizing philosophers), in addition to numerous homilies, hymns, and letters. The majority, so far as they have been edited, are reprinted in *MPG*, lxxxv., clx. (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Among the sources are the *Historia* of Dukas, pp. 142, 148, and of Georgios Phrantzes, pp. 305–308, in the *CSHB;* Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. xi., containing the *De Georgiis* of Leo Allatius. Consult: E. Renaudot, *De Gennadii vita et scriptis*, Paris, 1709, reprinted in *MPG*, clx. 249 sqq.; W. Gass, *Gennadius und Pletho*, Breslau, 1844; idem, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche*, pp. 34–39, Berlin, 1872; Steitz, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, xiii (1868), 672–677; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 119–121.

GENNADIUS OF MASSILIA: A presbyter of Massilia (Marseilles), contemporary of Pope Gelasius I. (492–496; cf. Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, xcix. [c.]), who, under the same title, continued Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, thus furnishing, in spite of many blunders, a very important source and in part the only source of our acquaintance with the ninety-one (ninety-three) authors treated therein. Gennadius knew Greek well and was well read in Eastern and Western, orthodox and heretical literature. He was a diligent compiler and a competent critic. His Semi-Pelagian attitude is evident in his eulogies of Cassian, Faustus of Riez, and others, as well as in his derogatory verdicts on the opposing side—Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, and even popes. The date of composition is uncertain. The present form of the text indicates a repeated revision of the entire work. It was edited by J. Andreas (Rome, 1468), by C. A. Bernoulli (Freiburg, 1895), by E. C. Richardson in

TU, xiv. (Leipsic, 1896), and is reprinted from J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica* (Hamburg, 1718), in *MPL*, lviii. 1059–1120. There is an Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., iii. 385–402. Gennadius also composed *Adversus omnes hæreses libri viii.;* five books against Nestorius; ten books against Eutyches; three books against Pelagius; a *Tractatus de millenio et de apocalypsi beati Johannis;* and an *Epistola de fide*, which he sent to Gelasius. There is also attributed to Gennadius a *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum* (Hamburg, 1614; reprinted in *MPL*, lviii. 979–1054), an abstract of catholic doctrine with a polemical bent. Its composition by Gennadius would appear to confirm his leaning toward Semi-Pelagianism. G. Krüger.

Bibliography: C. H. Turner, in *JTS*, vii (1906), 78–99; E. Jungmann, *Quæstiones Gennadianæ*, Leipsic, 1881; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, i. 447–449, ib. 1889; B. Czapla, *Gennadius als Litterarhistoriker*, Münster, 1898; F. Diekamp, in *Römische Quartalschrift*, xii (1898), 411–420; *DCB*, ii. 631–632; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, i. 409, Innsbruck, 1903; H. Koch, *Vincenz von Lerin und Gennadius*, in *TU*, xxxi. 2 (1907); Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, x. 600–606.

GENNARI, jen-nā'rî, CASIMIRO: Roman Catholic cardinal; b. at Maratea (96 m. s.e. of Naples), Italy, Dec. 29, 1839. He was educated at the Jesuit college in Salerno and the theological seminary at Naples. He then returned to his native city as a priest, and there founded the *Monitore Ecclesiastico*, a theological journal. In 1881 he was consecrated bishop of Conversano and in 1897 became assessor of the Holy Office at Rome with the title of archbishop of Lepanto. He was created cardinal priest of San Marcello al Corso in 1901, and is a member of the Congregations of the Consistory, Bishops and Regulars, the Council, Rites, Index, Indulgences, Apostolic Visitation, Provincial Councils, and Propaganda for the Oriental Rite, as well as a commissioner for the apostolic visitation of the dioceses of Italy and the *Opera preservationis fidei*.

GENNESARET, gen-nes'a-ret. See Galilee, § 4; Galilee, Sea of.

GENOA, ARCHBISHOPRIC OF: An ancient metropolitan see of North Italy. The first bishop named by tradition is Salomo or Salonius (c. 269); the first historically known is Valentinus (295; according to some authorities, c. 313). Under Syrus II. (1130–63), the see of Genoa, formerly suffragan to Milan, was raised to metropolitan rank by Innocent II. in 1133. As suffragan bishoprics it had at first only Bobbio and Brugnato, to which were added before long Ventimiglia, Noli, and Albenga, and then three of the six Corsican sees, Accia, Mariana, and Nebbio, the other three remaining under the jurisdiction of Pisa until the end of the thirteenth century. During the French Revolution some of these bishoprics were suppressed. By a bull of 1817 the province was reconstituted with the sees of Albenga, Bobbio, Brugnato, Noli-Savona, Tortona, and Nice; and it has the same to-day with the exception of Ventimiglia in place of Nice. The actual diocese of Genoa contains about 400,000 inhabitants. Among the early archbishops one of the most distinguished was Jacobus de Varagine (q.v.), 1292–98. From the fifteenth century the see was frequently occupied by cardinals.

Bibliography: F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, iv. 830–907, 10 vols., Venice, 1717–22; G. Cappelletti, *Le Chiesa d'Italia*, xiii. 269 sqq., 21 vols., Venice, 1844–70; M. Rosi, *Storia della relazione fra la republica di Genova e la chiesa Romana in rapporto alla riforma religiosa*, Rome, 1899; *KL*, v. 304–308.

GENOUDE, zhê"nūd', ANTOINE EUGÈNE DE: French priest and publicist; b. at Montélimar (135 m. s. of Lyons) 1792; d. at Hyères (12 m. e. of Toulon) Apr. 19, 1849. After teaching for a while at the Lycée Bonaparte, Paris, he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice. At the restoration of the Bourbons he became secretary and adjutant to Prince de Polignac. Entering journalism he collaborated in 1818 on the *Conservateur*, which was directed against the ministry of Decazes, and in 1820 joined Lemennais in founding the *Défenseur*. In 1821 he bought the *Étoile*, which became the official journal of the government. For his services to the government he was ennobled in 1822. In 1827 he revived the *Gazette de France*. After the July Revolution of 1830 his violent defense of the fallen dynasty involved him in troubles with the pope and the French bishops. In 1835 he entered the priesthood but soon returned to journalism. In 1846 he was elected a member of the Chamber of Deputies from Toulouse. Besides political writings, a translation of the Bible, and a translation of the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas à Kempis, his publications include, *La Raison du christianisme* (12 vols., Paris, 1834–35), a compilation from many sources; *La Vie de Jésus Christ et des apôtres* (2 vols., 1836); *Leçons et modèles de littérature sacrée* (1837); *Exposition du dogme catholique* (1840); *Sermons et conférences* (1844); and *L'histoire d'une âme* (1844), an autobiography.

Bibliography: Besides the autobiography, consult: *Biographie de M. de Genoude*, Paris, 1844; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 527–529.

GENTILE, jen-tî'lê, GIOVANNI VALENTINO: Antitrinitarian; d. at Bern Sept. 10, 1567. He was a native of Cosenza in Calabria, and was one of those Italians who about the middle of the sixteenth century left Italy to live freely according to their religious convictions. In 1556 or 1557 he came to Geneva. When in 1558 all members of the Italian colony were required to subscribe an orthodox confession which especially emphasized the Trinity, he preferred to leave the city for a time together with Alciati and Matteo Gribaldi (q.v.). Their countrymen brought them back and induced them to subscribe. Nevertheless the council proceeded (1558) against Gentile, and forced him to a humiliating submission and penance. He fled to Lyons, opposed Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity in the *Antidota*, dedicated to King Sigismund of Poland, whither he went in 1563. His name occurs from time to time during the next three years in letters from Poland. Then he returned to Switzerland and settled at Gex, which was under the jurisdiction of Bern. Fresh proceedings were instituted against him, on a charge of blaspheming the Holy Trinity and reviling the Reformed Church, and

ended in his execution. His theological position may be seen from the *Antidota* and from the confession which he presented to the Bern clergy (printed in Trechsel). Gentile opposed the traditional doctrine of the Trinity and its " fantastical and sophistical " terminology, but he professed to be attempting to vindicate the position of the Persons in the Trinity as something more than mere constituent parts of the divine substance. He hoped to escape the difficulties of the doctrine of the two natures by conceding the incarnation of the Logos in Mary as a person at once divine and human, though he thus obscured the doctrine of the perfect humanity of Christ. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Geneva process of 1558 was published by Fazy in *Mémoires de l'Institut Genevois*, vol. xiv., 1878–79; on the Bern process consult F. Trechsel, *Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier*, vol. ii., Heidelberg, 1844, where some details concerning Gentile are given. Consult also J. H. Allen, *Hist. of the Unitarians*, p. 62, New York, 1894.

GENTILLET, zhān"tî"lyê', INNOCENT: French Reformed jurist; b. at Vienne; d. at Geneva, the dates of his birth and death being unknown. After the massacre of St. Bartholomew he fled to Geneva, but after the peace of 1576 was made head of the council of Die, and became president of the Parliament of Grenoble a short time later. He was deprived of his position, however, by an edict of 1585, whereupon he seems to have again sought refuge in Geneva. One of his two political works, the *Discours sur les moyens de bien gouverner et maintenir en bonne paix un royaume ou autre principauté contre Nicolas Machiavel Florentin* (Geneva, 1576), was translated into English by S. Patericke, *A Discourse upon the Means of Wel Governing a Kingdom against N. Machiavell* (London, 1602). His *Apologia pro Christianis Gallis religionis evangelicæ seu reformatæ* (1578) ranks as one of the best defenses for the Reformation, while his *Le Bureau du concile de Trente* (1586) forms one of the ablest attacks upon the Council of Trent. (C. SCHMIDT†.)

GENTILLY, zhān"tî"yî' (GENTILIACUM), SYNOD OF, 767: An assembly mentioned in the Frankish annals, at which, in the presence of Greek and Roman emissaries, the doctrine of the Trinity, especially the procession of the Holy Spirit, and image-worship were discussed. It took place at Gentilly, a southern suburb of Paris, and was occasioned by a Byzantine embassy which had probably come for the purpose of winning the Frankish Church to the standpoint of Constantine V on the question of image-worship. The proceedings and resolutions of the synod are not known. The question concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit was only secondary and was probably stirred up by the papal nuncios for the purpose of sowing discord between the Franks and Greeks. There seems to have been no agreement, and this is only natural in consideration of the political conditions of Italy and the resolutions of the synod at Constantinople in 754 against image-worship. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 431–433, Eng. transl., v. 330–331, cf. Mansi, *Concilia*, xii. 613 sqq.

GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH (*Galfridus* or *Gaufridus Arturus, Galfridus Monemutensis;* Welsh *Galffrai* or *Gruffyd ap Arthur*): English chronicler; b., probably at Monmouth, c. 1100; d. at Llandaff 1154. He is thought to have been a monk of the Benedictine abbey at Monmouth, and about 1140 was made archdeacon of Llandaff. He was consecrated bishop of St. Asaph Feb. 24, 1152, but seems to have died before he actually entered on his duties there. Geoffrey is famous for his *Historia regum Britanniæ*, which was highly popular in all lands during the Middle Ages, furnished Sir Thomas Malory the material for his *Mort d'Arthur*, and has been drawn upon by poets from Shakespeare to Tennyson. It is a skilful mixture of history, legend, and pure romance, beginning with the fall of Troy and the story of Brutus, a descendant of Æneas, who is made the ancestor of the Britons, and ending with Cadwalader and the downfall of the Celtic power in Britain. The main source, Geoffrey states, was a " very old book " given him by Walter, archdeacon of Oxford, but he also used Gildas, Nennius, and Bede. The seventh of the twelve books appears to have been originally an independent work of Geoffrey's (*De prophetiis Merlini*). The text has been published by J. A. Giles (London, 1844) and in *Gottfried's von Monmouth Historia regum Britanniæ und Brut Tysylio herausgegeben von San Marte* [A. Schulz] (Halle, 1854); transl. by Aaron Thompson, *The British History* (London, 1718), revised and corrected by J. A. Giles, *Geoffrey of Monmouth's British History* (1842).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *ASB*, Oct., ix. 94–98; T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica, Anglo-Norman Period*, pp. 143–150, London, 1846; idem, *Essays on Archæological Subjects*, i. 202–226, ib. 1861; P. Paris, *Mémoire sur . l'hist. des Bretons de Monmouth.* Paris, 1865; T. Gilray, in *Dublin University Magazine*, April, 1876; A. de la Borderie, *Études historiques Brétonnes*, Paris, 1883; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 360–361; *DNB*, xxi. 133–135.

GEORGE III. OF ANHALT: Prince of Anhalt-Dessau; b. at Dessau Aug. 13 or 15, 1507; d. there Oct. 17, 1553. He was brought up with his brothers mainly by his devout mother Margaret, Duchess of Münsterberg. At the instance of his kinsman, Bishop Adolphus of Merseburg, he was elevated to the rank of canon in that see in 1518, and attended the University of Leipsic, where Georg Held of Forchheim was his " highly beloved master." In 1524 Adolphus consecrated him as priest. That he might be able the better to refute the Lutheran sect, he made a thorough study of the Bible, the Church Fathers, and church history. The extreme tension of mind and the qualms of conscience into which his investigations brought him induced a violent illness, which left its mark upon him for the rest of his life.

It was only after his mother's death (June, 1530) that he could see his way to entire clearness of faith; but from the time of the Diet of Augsburg (1530) both George and his brothers are found allied with the Reformers. After the first Evangelical celebration of the Lord's Supper at Dessau, on Maundy Thursday, 1534, George visited the district churches, making the fewest possible changes

in the church practises, in accordance with his natural disposition and with Luther's acquiescence. Loving peace, he sought to deter Luther, in 1538, from publishing the tract *Wider den Bischof zu Magdeburg;* and persuaded him, in 1542, not to circulate his sharply worded tract on the feud of Wurzen. In 1544 the protector of Merseburg Cathedral, Maurice of Saxony, appointed his brother, Duke Augustus, administrator, but because the latter was not a cleric, designated George of Anhalt as his "coadjutor in spiritual affairs." In this capacity he forthwith proceeded, in company with Antonius Musa, just then appointed cathedral preacher at Merseburg, upon a visitation of all the cathedral parishes, exhibiting great patience, tactful discretion, and forbearance. He next conferred with Maurice in the matter of a prospective liturgy, which, in accordance with his suggestions and in virtue of the deliberations of the consistories of Merseburg and Meissen, was officially completed at Altenzelle in 1545. Thenceforth twice a year George convened the cathedral clergy to a synod in Merseburg Cathedral, and on such occasions discoursed upon the questions and evils of the time, and upon proper official conduct. He based these *conciones synodicæ* upon outlines furnished him by Melanchthon. Of the sermons which he delivered in the cathedral before many hearers, only a few have been preserved. They are distinguished by temperate and lucid exposition.

When, in spite of his efforts to the contrary, the Schmalkald War broke out, George received under his roof the fugitive Camerarius and his family; interceded for Jonas, who had incurred Maurice's anger; and sought to restrain the clergy from "suspicious and frivolous words that might serve to cause discord." Although he "hated" the Augsburg Interim, he felt that he ought to lend a hand in the preparation of the Leipsic Interim, in order to preclude still worse results (see INTERIM). In 1549 the emperor's candidate Michael Heldingk (Sidonius) was postulated by the chapter as bishop of Merseburg. Until his arrival, George was to continue administering the diocese. To strengthen the Evangelical confession as firmly as possible before the threatening storm, he now delivered his powerful sermons "On the False Prophets," and "On the Right Worthy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," which are directed both against Rome and against the fanatics. Afterward he retired to his Anhalt estates. Sojourning mostly in Warmsdorf he continued to preach there, and when occasion offered sought to adjust the Osiandrian dispute. He died unmarried after lingering sickness. His unfeigned piety, his gentleness and love of peace, his benevolence and freedom of service, gained him the honorable title of the "devout" or "pious." His theology was that of Luther.

WILHELM WALTHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His writings in German were edited by Melanchthon, Wittenberg, 1555, 7th ed., 1741, Latin edition containing the *Conciones synodicæ*, 1570; the *Conciones* were edited by G. Stier in Germ. transl., 1895. For his life consult: *Leben der Altväter der lutherischen Kirche*, iv. 63 sqq., Leipsic, 1864 (contains lists of the older literature); M. Steffenhagen, *Georg von Anhalt*, Merseburg, 1893; A. Rümelin, *Die Reformation in Dessau*, Halle, 1895.

GEORGE, BISHOP OF THE ARABIANS: One of the most important writers of the Syrian Church; was born about 640 in the Juma, the district of the lower Afrin valley, belonging to the diocese of Antioch, and died in 724.

Life.

As a youth he attached himself to his famous countryman Jacob of Edessa (q.v.), whose *Hexaemeron* he completed after Jacob's death. In Nov., 686, in conformity with the dying wish of the Patriarch Athanasius II. of Balad, he was consecrated bishop by the Jacobite Maphrian Sergius Zakunaja, archbishop of Kartamin near Mardin. His jurisdiction was not a local one, but included the Arab tribes on the eastern border of the northern half of the Arabian desert. Doctrinally he was attached to the Jacobite church of Syria, as is shown by his dogmatic and controversial writings.

He had an extensive knowledge of both Christian and classical literature. Besides the Bible, he knew the principal church historians, Eusebius, Socrates, and Theodoret. In Basil's works he was specially at home, and was well acquainted with Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, as well as with the Monophysite authorities to whom the Jacobites appealed, especially the patriarch Severus of Antioch; he knew both Cyril of Alexandria and Sabellius and Julian of Halicarnassus, and was very familiar with the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius. He was not less well-read in the older Syriac literature, Bardesanes, Aphraates, and Ephraem. Even of works still further removed, like those of Josephus and the Clementines, he displays more than a superficial knowledge. His extensive correspondence, of which the letters from 714 to 718 still exist, shows that he was the intellectual leader of his countrymen.

Mental Equipment.

The greater part of his works is still extant, and shows his many-sidedness, not only covering the most various theological branches, but including a valuable translation of a part of the *Organon* of Aristotle, with the fullest commentary on that author existing in Syriac. With this Aristotelian work may be classed, as to both plan and purpose, a collection of scholia on the homilies of Gregory Nazianzen (preserved in a tenth or eleventh century manuscript in the British Museum), though neither the translation of the homilies nor the writing of the scholia was done by George, who only compiled them.

Prose Works.

Of his poetical works, the *Chronicon*, written in twelve-syllable verse, was formerly preserved in a single manuscript in the Vatican, which has now totally disappeared. This dealt in twenty-four chapters with the epacts, with rules for finding the movable feasts, with the cycles of the sun and moon, with the months and weeks, and other things pertaining to the ecclesiastical reckoning. The table for finding the time of the new moon which originally formed part of this has been preserved separately in two copies, one in the Vatican and one in the British Museum. The author's competence in these astronomical questions is shown

Poetical Works.

by two letters to John, a priest in the monastery of Litharb (Al-Atharib, near Aleppo), in which he takes a standpoint far in advance of the astrological superstitions of his age. Of the three poems still extant, one (British Museum and Bodleian) treats of the monastic life, and gives eloquent expression to the mystical enthusiasm of the Monophysite tradition in his portrayal of the blessedness of the monk's condition. The others have reference to the consecration of the sacred chrism, which, after the symbolist manner of the Pseudo-Dionysius, is mystically connected with the Anointed One; in both a large part is played by the Old Testament and its ceremonies, as types of the more perfect dispensation and its mysteries and festivals. The longer poem (Vatican, Paris) closely follows the ritual of the consecration of the oil; the shorter (Brit. Mus.) covers the same ground more concisely. In connection with these may be mentioned a prose explanation of the sacraments (Brit. Mus.), which treats only of baptism, the Eucharist, and the blessing of the chrism, George apparently recognizing (like the Pseudo-Dionysius, whom he follows) none but these as sacraments. The above-mentioned conclusion to the *Hexaemeron* of Jacob of Edessa takes it up at the resurrection, and deals with the Last Judgment and the recompense of good and evil deeds. Like Origen and other Greek fathers, especially Gregory of Nyssa and the theologians of the school of Antioch, as well as the Monophysite Stephen bar Sudaili, George teaches the doctrine of the final restoration of all things.

Letters.

For the study, however, of George's doctrinal position, his letters (contained in a manuscript of the eighth or early ninth century, Brit. Mus.) are of the greatest importance; they show what scientific questions chiefly occupied the clergy and monks of his time, what dogmatic questions were most frequently discussed, and how ecclesiastical legislation was carried out in the daily life of the Church. An idea of their contents may best be given by taking them according to their subjects without regard to their chronological order. Under the head of church history may be placed the first three chapters of the longest of all, addressed to the presbyter Joshua the Recluse under date of July, 714. These chapters deal with the life and times of the " Persian sage," i.e., Aphraates, and discuss the theory that the end of the world will come after six thousand years, the doctrine of the sleep of the soul after death and its awakening, and the question why Noah did not warn his contemporaries of the flood—a question which was not, indeed, treated in the homilies of Aphraates, but had occurred to Joshua while reading them. In the fifth chapter George gives the life and teaching of Gregory the Illuminator, the apostle of the Armenians, finally discussing the question whether Gregory was justified in forbidding his Armenian converts to mix water with the wine of the Lord's Supper, as was the Syrian custom. In this chapter especially notable are the keen critical insight and the strict historical judgment, cleverly avoiding the miraculous, with which he handles the material before him. A second division of the letters is composed of those of an exegetical nature. Assemani is wrong in attributing to George the composition of a commentary on the Bible and especially on Matthew: what he did, after the fashion of his time, was to discuss particular questions which interested him or were put to him by others. With these points of Biblical exegesis may be classed the expositions of passages in Greek and Syriac writers, such as Gregory Nazianzen, Ephraem Syrus, and Jacob of Edessa. A third class, those of doctrinal interest, are partly didactic and partly polemical. Of the former nature are the eighth chapter of the long letter to Joshua, in which he holds fast (like the other Greek and Syrian theologians) to the freedom of the will, and a letter to the John already mentioned, on the part which the priest plays in the forgiveness of sins, which George reduces to very moderate proportions. The polemical letters are principally concerned with Christological questions, and are particularly interesting as showing that Monophysite opposition was then directed not against the Nestorians but against the adherents of the Council of Chalcedon—a fact which would be hard to explain historically if knowledge did not exist of the difference in belief already existing between Cyril of Alexandria and Severus, George's main authority. A fourth division deals with questions of church law and ritual, and includes the fourth and seventh chapters of the letter to Joshua, as well as another to him of 718, in which he answers three questions relative to the proper celebration of the Eucharist. Finally, a fifth division of ascetical bearing may be made of the ninth chapter of the letter to Joshua, in which he deals with nocturnal temptation and the means to be employed in combating it.

Importance.

The value of the works of George lies in the manner in which they increase the knowledge of the history of the Syrian Church and literature, giving a picture which is all the richer for the many-sidedness of his activity, and all the more instructive for his standing precisely midway between the authors who open and close Syriac literature, Ephraem (d. 373) and Gregory bar Hebræus (d. 1286). Although he far surpasses the imperfect beginnings of strictly Syrian learning in Aphraates, the practically edifying character of his poetical work especially reminds of the attitude of primitive Christianity, which was preserved longer in Syria than elsewhere. But when we look at the height reached by his scientific thought, trained not only by Aristotle's logic but by Aristotle's knowledge of nature and of the world, we recognize at once the mighty influence which Greek learning had upon the mind of the Church, even in the far East. George not only made his own all that Greek literature and philosophy could give him, but he stands out above the other scholars of his race by his thoughtful use of this abundant material, by his excellent judgment and keen insight, and by the freedom and wide range of his outlook.

(Victor Ryssel†.)

Bibliography: Parts of his works have been published as follows: his letter to the presbyter Joshua is in P. de Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, p. 108, Leipsic, 1858; the first

three chapters of this letter are also in W. Wright's edition of the Homilies of Aphraates, pp. 19–37, London, 1869, and in the work of J. Forget, *De vita et scriptis Aphraatis*, pp. 1–56, Louvain, 1882; his great poem on the consecration of the oil and that on the life of the monks were edited by V. Ryssel in the *Atti* of the Reale accademia dei Lincei, vol. ix., part 1, 1892. On his life consult: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, vol. i., chap. xvi., Rome, 1719; E. Renan, *De philosophia peripatetica*, pp. 32 sqq., Paris, 1852; J. G. E. Hoffmann, *De hermeneuticis apud Syros*, pp. 148–151, Leipsic, 1869; V. Ryssel, *Ein Brief Georg's . mit einer Einleitung über sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Gotha, 1883; idem, *Georg's des Araberbischofs Gedichte und Briefe . . übersetzt und erläutert*, Leipsic, 1891; W Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, pp. 156–159, London, 1894.

GEORGE OF BRANDENBURG: Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach; b. at Onolzbach (Ansbach, 25 m. s.w. of Nuremberg), Middle Franconia, Mar. 4, 1484; d. there Dec. 27, 1543. He was the third of the eight sons of Margrave Frederick the Elder and a grandson of Albert Achilles, the founder of the Ansbach-Kulmbach Hohenzollern line. Through his mother, Sophie, a Polish princess, sister of King Ladislaus II. of Bohemia and Hungary, he was related to the royal court in Buda. He entered the service of his uncle, the king of Hungary, living at his court from 1506. The king received him as an adopted son, entrusted him in 1515 with the duchy of Oppeln, and in 1516 made him member of the tutelary government instituted for Hungary, and tutor of his son Louis.

His Territories and Influence.

At the court of Hungary there were two parties arrayed against each other—the Magyar party under the leadership of Zapolyas and the German party under the leadership of George of Brandenburg, whose authority was increased by the acquisition of the duchies of Ratibor and Oppeln by hereditary treaties with their respective dukes and of the territories of Oderberg, Beuthen, and Tarnowitz as pledges from the king of Bohemia, who could not redeem his debts. By the further appropriation of the duchy of Jägerndorf, George came into possession of all Upper Silesia. As the owner and mortgagee of these territories he prepared the way for the introduction of the Reformation, here as well as in his native Franconia. At an earlier time than any other German prince and any other member of the Hohenzollern line, even before his younger brother Albert, the grand master of the Teutonic Order (see ALBERT OF PRUSSIA), he turned his eyes and heart to the new faith proceeding from Wittenberg.

He Accepts the Reformation.

The first Reformatory writings began the work of winning him over to the Evangelical cause. Luther's powerful testimony of faith at the Diet of Worms in 1521 made an indelible impression upon his mind, and the vigorous sermons of Evangelical preachers in the pulpits of St. Lawrence and St. Sebald in Nuremberg, during the diet there in 1522, deepened the impression. The study of Luther's translation of the New Testament, which appeared in 1522, established his faith on personal conviction. Moreover, he entered into correspondence with Luther, discussing with him the most important problems of faith, and in 1524 met him personally on the occasion of the negotiations of his brother, Albert, regarding the reformation of the Teutonic Order and its transformation into a secular duchy. George was aided in his reformatory efforts, after the accession of King Louis, by his wife, Queen Mary, a sister of Charles V. and Ferdinand, who was favorably inclined toward the new doctrine. As the councilor of the young king, George firmly advocated the cause of the new Gospel against the influences and intrigues of his clerical opponents and successfully prevented their violent measures. His relationship with Duke Frederick II. of Liegnitz, Brieg, and Wohlen and Duke Charles I. of Münsterberg-Oels, who had both admitted the Reformation into their countries, contributed not a little to the expansion of the Gospel in his own territories. But it was his own personal influence, energy, and practical spirit that introduced the new doctrine and founded a new Evangelical and churchly life. He made efforts to secure preachers of the new Gospel from Hungary, Silesia, and Franconia, and tried to introduce the church order of Brandenburg-Nuremberg, which had already found admission in the Franconian territories.

The Reformation in Franconia.

In the hereditary lands of Franconia, where with his older brother Casimir he had assumed the regency in place of their father, he encountered greater difficulties, although the popular spirit was inclined toward the Reformation. Owing to his marriage with a Bavarian princess and to his military commandership in the imperial service, his brother was allied more closely with the old Church and resisted the new reformatory efforts. But the pressure of the estates of the land soon compelled him to allow preaching according to Luther's doctrine, although he exacted the retention of the old church ceremonies, even of those that were contrary to the Gospel. George protested against such half-measures and showed his dissatisfaction with the half-hearted resolutions of the state assembly of Oct., 1526. It was only after the death of his brother, that as sole ruler he could successfully undertake and carry out the Reformation in the Franconian territories, with the assistance of his councilors Johann von Schwarzenberg and the chancellor George and through the new resolutions of the state assembly of Ansbach (1528). At the same time George maintained his correspondence with Luther and Melanchthon, discussing such questions as the evangelization of monasteries, the use of monastic property for Evangelical purposes, and especially the foundation of lower schools for the people and of higher schools for the education of talented young men for the service of Church and State. He tried to gain, by his continued correspondence with Luther and other Reformers such as Urbanus Rhegius, efficient men for the preaching of the Gospel and for the organization of the Evangelical Church. Hand in hand with the Council of Nuremberg he worked for the institution of a church visitation after the model of that of electoral Saxony from which developed after repeated revisions and emendations the excellent church order of Brandenburg-Nuremberg of 1533. After its in-

troduction in his territories in Franconia and Nuremberg, it entered also his dominions in Upper Silesia.

His Influence and Activity Beyond his Territories.

Margrave George's influence manifested itself also in the development of the German Reformation as a whole. When a union of the Evangelicals in Upper and Lower Germany was contemplated for the more successful defense against the dangers accruing to the new Gospel from the Roman Church, George had a meeting with the elector of Saxony at Schleitz in 1529, where they agreed on certain articles of faith and confession to be drawn up by Luther; the commission was executed in the seventeen articles of Schwabach on the basis of the fifteen theses of the Marburg Colloquy. But neither at the Convention of Schwabach nor at that of Schmalkalden did George approve armed resistance against the emperor and his party even in self-defense. The more energetically, however, did he oppose the emperor at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, when the emperor demanded the prohibition of Evangelical preaching. King Ferdinand made George the most alluring offers of Silesian possessions if he would take the part of the emperor, but he decidedly rejected them. Next to the elector of Saxony, he stands foremost among the faithful and brave princes who defended the Evangelical faith. After the death of his cousin, Joachim I. of Brandenburg, who was a strict Romanist, he assisted his sons in the introduction of the Reformation in the territories of Brandenburg. He took part in the Religious Colloquy of Regensburg (1541) where Elector Joachim II. made a last attempt to bridge over the differences between the Romanists and Evangelicals and with his nephew requested Luther's cooperation. The Diet of Regensburg was the last religious meeting which he attended.

(David Erdmann†.)

Bibliography: W Löhe, *Erinnerungen aus der Reformations-Geschichte von Franken*, Nuremberg, 1847; L. Neustadt, *Markgraf Georg als Erzieher am ungarischen Hofe*, Breslau, 1883; T. Kolde, *Analecta Lutherana*, Gotha, 1883; idem, in *ZKG*, xiii (1892), parts 2-3; J. Meyer, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Franken*, Ansbach, 1893; H. Westermayer, *Die brandenburgisch-nürnbergische Kirchenvisitation 1528-33*, Erlangen, 1894; F. Vogthern, *Die Verfassung der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in den Fürstentümern Ansbach und Bayreuth*, ii. 209, 269, Erlangen, 1896.

GEORGE, DUKE OF SAXONY (George the Bearded): Violent opponent of Luther; b. at Dresden Aug., 1471; d. there Apr. 17, 1539. He was the oldest surviving son of Albert the Courageous, ancestor of the Albertine line of sovereigns in Saxony. Although heir to the throne, he was destined for the priesthood, probably under the influence of his mother. One of his teachers in theology was Andreas Proles, the predecessor of Staupitz in the German Augustinian congregation, and widely known as a courageous fighter against the abuses in the order, and as a pious preacher. This education influenced the whole life of George; he became not only a sincerely pious and well-educated man, but also enough of a theologian to have an independent judgment in ecclesiastical matters. As early as his seventeenth year he was entrusted with the government of his country while his father fought in distant lands, and in 1500 he succeeded his father as actual ruler.

George welcomed with sincere joy the Reformation at Wittenberg and the theses of Luther. In the spring of 1517 he declared himself very decidedly against Tetzel, the dealer in indulgences, and branded his practise as fraud. But his very first meeting with Luther, in July, 1518, when Luther, especially recommended by Staupitz, preached in the castle church of Dresden, aroused opposition. By this sermon the duke became aware of the fact that Luther aimed not only at certain reforms of the Church, but, in opposition to ruling Catholicism, announced a new Gospel which was bound to result in a complete rupture with the traditions of the past. Such a revolutionist George decidedly opposed. He was confirmed in his opinion of Luther by the ideas which the latter expressed at the Leipsic Disputation (1519). He had no objection to Luther's bold attacks on the abuses in the Church and found many a truth in his address "To the nobility of the German nation"; but the continual desertion of monks and nuns, the violation of the vow of celibacy, and the disturbances among the peasants fully convinced him that Luther's Gospel was an un-Christian affair, since the Bible teaches that the tree shall be known by its fruits. The fruits of Luther's activity were, in George's opinion, renunciation of all discipline and order, disobedience, violence, and the violation of the most sacred vows; the world can not exist without authority, and only the Church has power to bring about reforms. Landgrave Philip of Hesse, his son-in-law, tried in vain to win him over, especially by the Bible. In spite of his independent character, George seems to have been influenced not a little in his unfavorable attitude toward the new Gospel by his reactionary secretaries, Hieronymus Emser and Johannes Cochlæus. By the manner of his polemics Emser excited Luther in such a way that his cutting replies against him and the duke can not always be justified. Emser's last work, an emended translation of the New Testament, was intended to compete with Luther's great work, but differed so little from it that it only helped the cause of the Reformation. After having awaited in vain the promised council, Duke George ordered visitations and the reform of monasteries on his own responsibility and tried to abolish abuses, but his efforts were not successful. He made his life-work a vain struggle to stem the tide of the Reformation, and his failure was the more tragical as it isolated him from his people and even from his own family. The end of his life was saddened by the prospect that after his death the new Gospel would enter his country freely and openly, since his brother Henry, the heir to the throne, had adopted the Lutheran cause. George's last attempt to save his country for Romanism by ceding it to Ferdinand, the Roman king, was frustrated by the opposition of the estates of Meissen and by his sudden death.

(F. W. Dibelius.)

Bibliography: H. Welck, *Georg der Bärtige*, Brunswick, 1900; F. Gess, *Klostervisitationen des Herzog Georg*, Leipsic, 1888; idem, in *ZKG*, 1888; idem, *Akten und*

Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen, vol. i., 1517-24, Leipsic, 1905; articles in the *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte* by Friedensburg, *Briefwechsel zwischen Herzog Georg und Philipp von Hessen*, 1885; by Gess, *Leipzig und Wittenberg*, 1895, and by E. Brandenburg, *Herzog Heinrich der Fromme*, 1896; K. Mensing, *Bilder aus der sächsischen Geschichte*, Dresden, 1902; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 178, 181, 292, 567; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., *The Reformation*, pp. 135, 148, 163-252.

GEORGE OF LAODICEA: Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, one of the leaders of the homoiousian party; b. in Alexandria; d. between 360 and 363. Alexander of Alexandria made him presbyter, and before the Council of Nicæa, during a stay at Antioch, George tried to mediate in the controversy between Alexander and the Arians. The opponents of the Arians treated him as Arian, and Alexander deposed him. George then joined the "Eusebians," and before 335 they procured him the bishopric of Laodicea; he took part in the Synod of Antioch in 339 and for doing so was anathematized by the Occidentals. George regarded the Nicene doctrine as Sabellianism and was an especial enemy of Athanasius; but he did not altogether agree with Eusebius of Nicomedia since he opposed Arianism sharply, and, with Bishop Basil of Ancyra, became founder of the homoiousian party. The new attitude of George after 358 can hardly be called a change of conviction since the homoiousian formulas may be traced back to the Christology of Alexander of Alexandria who influenced his youth. After the Synod of Seleucia George disappears. It is said that he took part in the homoian synod at Constantinople in 360, having submitted at that time, like many other homoiousians, to the power of the court; this is possible, but George of Laodicea seems to have been confounded with George of Doara, the Arian. Of his writings there have been preserved a few sentences of a letter found in Athanasius, *De synodis*, xvii. (*MPG*, xxvi. 712, CD), a letter in Sozomen (IV., xiii. 2-3) and a memorial in Epiphanius (*Hær.*, lxxiii. 22, end). It is said that he wrote also an "Encomium of Eusebius of Emesa," and a treatise against the Manicheans. (F Loofs).

Bibliography: Sources are the histories by Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, and the "History of the Arians" by Athanasius, all available in Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser. Consult: Leo Allatius in *Georgii Acropolitæ . historia*, p. 305-306, Paris, 1651; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vi. 259 of Venice ed.; M. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, ii. 792-793, Paris, 1740; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 327, ix. 293, Hamburg, 1801, 1804; J. H. Newman, *The Arians of the 4th Century*, p. 284, London, 1871; J. Dräseke, *Gesammelte patristische Untersuchungen*, Altona, 1889; *DCB*, ii. 637-638; *KL*, v. 335-336; and the literature under Arianism.

GEORGE THE PISIDIAN: Byzantine poet and historian; flourished in the first half of the seventh century. He was a deacon in the church of St. Sophia, Constantinople, and enjoyed the favor of the Patriarch Sergius, and of the Emperor Heraclius, whom he accompanied on his first campaign against the Persians. He wrote a number of long poems of historical, philosophical, and religious content, which were highly praised by the latter Byzantine writers, though modern criticism has condemned them as artificial and tedious. The *Hexaemeron seu mundi officium*, and his *De vanitate vitæ* were printed, with a Latin translation, by F. Morel (Paris, 1584), and his complete works, with Latin translation and a critical introduction, were edited by G. M. Querci (Rome, 1777). This edition was reprinted in *CSHB*, vol. xiv., and also in *MPG*, xcii.

Bibliography: Leo Allatius, *De Georgiis*, in Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x. 561-569, Hamburg, 1807; I. Hilberg, in *Wiener Studien*, viii (1886), 292-304, ix (1887), 207-222 (on the *Hexaemeron*); L. Sternbach, *De Georgio Pisida Nonni sectatore*, Cracow, 1893; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 709-712 et passim; *KL*, v. 337-338; *DCB*, ii. 648-649.

GEORGE OF POLENTZ: Bishop of Samland in Prussia, the first bishop who avowed the Evangelical faith; b. in Saxony 1478; d. in Balga (24 m. s.w. of Königsberg, on the Frische Haff) Oct. 1, 1549. He descended from one of the most prominent and ancient families of the Saxon nobility, studied law in Italy, was for some time private secretary of Pope Julius II., then entered the service of Emperor Maximilian I. He became acquainted with Margrave Albert of Brandenburg (see Albert of Prussia), a later grand master of the Teutonic Order, and subsequently joined the Order. By the faithful and able execution of several important commissions in the affairs of the Order he won the confidence of Albert, through whose influence he became bishop of Samland (1519). When he assumed in 1522 the regency of the Order in the absence of the grand master, his mind had already been turned toward the Evangelical cause by the writings of Luther. In 1523 he tolerated the preaching of the pure Gospel in the cathedral church of Königsberg and put no obstacle in the way of the Reformatory movement. After 1524 he advocated the nullification of the papal constitution and the secularization of the Order. On the recommendation of Luther, Johannes Briessmann became cathedral preacher at Königsberg, and introduced the bishop to a deeper knowledge of the Evangelical doctrine of salvation. In the summer of 1523 the bishop publicly avowed the cause of the Reformation. In a mandate of 1524 he admonished his subjects to accept the new doctrine, and, instigated by the ignorance of his people, advocated in another mandate the preaching of the Gospel in the vernacular. As early as 1524 he sent Evangelical preachers from place to place, as many as he could gather. While he himself received instruction from Briessmann in Greek and Hebrew to study the Bible in the original text, he inculcated upon his preachers the diligent use of the Bible and of Luther's translation and his most important writings. After the transformation of the Order into a secular duchy (see Teutonic Order), Albert on his return to Königsberg in 1525 immediately entrusted George of Polentz and his second bishop, Erhard von Queiss in Pomerania, with the organization of Evangelical church life. The first church orders and visitations were prepared by Bishop Polentz in connection with Briessmann and Paulus Speratus, the new preacher of Königsberg. The first Prussian church order was issued in 1525 under the title, *Artikel der Ceremonien und anderer Kirchenordnung*, and thus the Prussian State Church was organized before that of electoral Saxony. Bishop Polentz considered it an essential part of

his official activity to hold church visitations, being convinced of the great importance of the personal influence of the bishop upon the preachers and their congregations. The chief interest of his activity lay in the organization of the Church, on the basis of the Gospel and the confessional doctrine. He was also prominently active in the foundation and development of the University of Königsberg (1544). His marriage in 1525 was of the most far-reaching influence, as he gave by it a practical testimony for the Evangelical truth and an example for the foundation of the Evangelical parsonage.

(DAVID ERDMANN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Tschackert, *Georg von Polentz*, Leipsic, 1888; idem, *Urkundenbuch der Reformations-Geschichte in Preussen*, vol. i., ib. 1890; *Vita Georgii a Polentiis*, Königsberg, 1829; A. R. Gebser and E. Hagen, *Der Dom zu Königsberg*, pp. 242–243, ib. 1835; J. Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens*, ix. 685–686, ib. 1839; *Georg von Polentz, der erste evangelische Bischof*, Halle, 1858; J. Köstlin, *Mortin Luther*, ed. G. Kawerau, i. 622, 720, Berlin, 1903; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., *The Reformation*, pp. 160–162, New York, 1904; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 593 sqq.

GEORGE, SAINT: Christian martyr, the patron saint of England; b. of a noble Cappadocian family in the third century; d. about 303. That the Roman army possessed an officer of high rank by the name of George (Lat. *Georgius*), who suffered martyrdom in the Diocletian persecution after repeatedly professing his faith, can scarcely be doubted, although the year of his death is uncertain. Churches were erected in his honor at a very early period, as at Thessalonica in the fifth century, while Gregory of Tours is witness to the wide extension of his cult in the Occident. Gregory the Great is said, on somewhat doubtful authority, to have restored a church of St. George in Rome, identified with Santo Giorgio in Velabro.

According to the acts of his martyrdom, which are late and historically valueless, St. George resigned his commission shortly after the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution, and bore zealous testimony against the informers and persecutors. After the emperor had sought in vain to induce him to apostatize, the saint was condemned to die by the sword, whereupon he distributed all his property among the poor and prayed fervently for the constancy of his fellow Christians. According to some sources, he was martyred at Lydda in Palestine, and according to others at Nicomedia in Bithynia. The only point of agreement concerning the date of his death is in the statement that the day was Apr. 23.

The chief points in the development of the cult of St. George in the Eastern Church were the erection of a number of churches in his honor in Constantinople and of a monastery near the Hellespont, whence the latter was called St. George's Arm; the building of many churches to him in Armenia and the name of Georgia applied to the country to the north; and the tribute paid to him in Russia, where the Czars bear his effigy in the center of their coat of arms. In the West St. George became one of the fourteen "Helpers in Need" (q.v.) and the patron saint of the Republic of Genoa, as well as of the English Order of the Garter and of many military orders. The English crusaders of Richard Cœur de Lion were under his special protection, and a decree of a national council held at Oxford in 1222 made his day (Apr. 23) a holiday for all England. Since the later Middle Ages the Western universities have regarded this saint as the patron of artists. St. George first appears as the slayer of a dragon and the liberator of a maiden from her chains in the late medieval period, and in this aspect is a legendary Christian recrudescence of Perseus, influenced by the Germanic Siegfried.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The various legends, under the titles of *Acta, encomium, miracula, passio*, and *translation*, are collected in *ASB*, April, iii. 117–163 and appendix, pp. xx.–xlv.; cf. *Analecta Bollandiana*, i (1882), 615–617. Consult P. Heylin, *Historie of that Famous Saint and Souldier . . Saint George of Cappadocia*, London, 1633; T. Lowick, *Hist. of the Life and Martyrdom of Saint George*, ib. 1664; J. Milner, *Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Existence and Character of St. George . . .*, ib. 1795; P. Heber, *Die vorkarolingischen christlichen Glaubenshelden am Rhein*, pp. 273–283, Frankfort, 1858; F. Gorres, in *ZWT*, 1887, pp. 54–70; E. A. W. Budge, *The Martyrdom and Miracles of St. George of Cappadocia. Coptic Texts with Eng. Transl.*, London, 1888; *St. George, Champion of Christendom and Patron Saint of England*, London, 1907.

GEORGE SYNCELLUS: Byzantine historian of the eighth century, who wrote a *Chronographia* (ed. J. Goar, Paris, 1652; W Dindorf, 2 vols., Bonn, 1829), which is valuable for its extracts from other writers. J. J. Scaliger's text of the first book of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius is composed entirely of fragments preserved in the work of Syncellus. He received his surname from the fact that he was syncellus, or privy councilor, to Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople (see SYNCELLUS).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His works in 2 vols., ed. G. Dindorf, are in *CSHB*, Bonn, 1829. Consult: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 118–120; *DCB*, ii. 650; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, i. 734–735, Innsbruck, 1903; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 155–156.

GEORGE OF TREBIZOND: Greek scholar and humanist in Italy; b. in Crete 1396; d. at Rome 1486. His ancestors had come from the city of Trebizond, hence his cognomen. He settled in Venice in 1420 as a teacher of Greek, philosophy, and rhetoric, taught for a number of years in Vicenza, and in 1442 removed to Rome, where he enjoyed the patronage of Eugenius IV and particularly that of Nicholas V He was a pronounced Aristotelian and made a great reputation as a translator and expounder of Aristotle. Through his bitter and unfair attacks on Bessarion, Gemistos Plethon, and the Platonic school he lost the favor of Nicholas; and so great was the general indignation against him that he would have been compelled to leave Italy had not King Alphonso V given him protection at Naples. Later he was made papal abbreviator by his pupil Paul II. Besides translations from Plato and Aristotle, his writings include Latin translations from the Greek Church Fathers (e.g., the commentaries of Cyril and the *Præparatio evangelica* of Eusebius), and two essays against the Greek Church to be found in Allatius, *Græcia orthodoxa* (Rome, 1652).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Scattered notices are to be found in Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vols. iii., vii.–ix., xi., xii., Hamburg, 1793–1809; *KL*, v. 347; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 534–535, Paris, 1878.

GEORGIOS SCHOLARIOS. See GENNADIUS II.

GER. See PROSELYTES; STRANGER.

GERARD, je-rūrd′ (Fr. *Gérard,* zhe-rūr′; Germ. *Gerhard*): The name of sixty or seventy worthies in the hagiological tradition of the Roman Church, some classed as saints, some as blessed. Among the more noteworthy are:

1. Saint Gerard of Brogne: Abbot of Brogne (*Bronium,* Braine-le-Comte, 13 m. n.n.e. of Mons), reformer of Benedictine monasteries in Lorraine and Flanders; b. at Staves (*Stablecellæ*) in the diocese of Namur, between 880 and 890; d. in the monastery of Brogne, presumably Oct. 3, 959. He descended from a noble family and in his youth served under Count Berengar of Namur. While on a hunting trip with the count, he retired to a chapel to pray and beheld a vision of the apostles; Peter asked him to build a larger church in place of the chapel in honor of Peter and the martyr Eugene, and to bring thither the bones of the latter. Gerard obeyed, built a church and a canonry (913), and devoted himself to an ascetic life. He went to Paris and studied in the monastery of St. Denis. After having been consecrated presbyter, he returned to Brogne, about 923, as an independent abbot. From St. Denis he brought the relics of Eugene and many other saints. The rumor of miracles effected by these relics in the church of Brogne spread far and wide, and people came in such crowds that Gerard shut himself up in a small cell to conclude his days in quietness and prayer; but he was repeatedly called from his hiding-place as a reformer. In 931 Duke Giselbert of Lorraine asked him to introduce the Benedictine order in the demoralized monastery of St. Ghislain in the diocese of Cambrai. Six years later Count Arnulph of Flanders called him to restore the destroyed monastery of St. Bavo in Ghent and to introduce the Benedictine rule in the neighboring canonry of Blandinium. Several other monasteries were subsequently reformed by Gerard after strictly Benedictine principles, especially St. Bertin of Flanders, in the diocese of Therouanne about 944 and St. Amand in the diocese of Tournai 952. Apparently in this later period of his life, he made a pilgrimage to Rome to ask the blessing of the pope for his institutions and a privilege for his monastery of Brogne. After his return, he undertook a general visitation of his monasteries. Various miracles, it is said, were wrought by his dead body, in consequence of which Innocent II. canonized him. The monastery was united to the bishopric of Namur by Paul IV. in 1556.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An anonymous *Vita* with commentary is in *ASB,* Oct., ii. 200–320; the *Vita* is also in *MGH, Script.,* xv (1888), 654–673, cf. *Ex virtutibus S. Eugenii,* ib. pp. 646–652, and *Sermo de adventu S. Eugenii* in *Analecta Bollandiana,* v. 395 sqq. Consult: U. Berlière, *Monasticon Belge,* i. 28 sqq., Bruges, 1890 (contains very complete list of literature); P. Gunther, *Das Leben des heiligen Gerhard,* Halle, 1877; W Schultze, *Gerhard von Brogne und die Klosterreform,* in *Forschungen der deutschen Geschichte,* xxv. 223–271, Göttingen, 1885; A. Servais, *Essai sur la vie de S. Gérard,* Namur, 1885; E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacensur,* i. 121–141, Halle, 1892; Hauck, *KD,* iii. 345–349.

2. Gerard Sagredo: Bishop of Csanad (44 m. n. of Temesvar), eastern Hungary; b. at Venice c. 960; d. at Csanad Sept. 24, 1046. Before he went as missionary to the Magyars he lived as a monk in San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice. In recognition of his successful missionary work Stephen I. of Hungary gave him the honorary title Apostle of Hungary and made him bishop of Csanad in 1036. He retained his bishopric under the two less Christian successors of Stephen, until his death as a martyr. He is said to have been the first to teach the Hungarians to address the Virgin Mary as "Our Lady."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An anonymous *Vita* and an *Elogium* with comment are printed in *ASB,* Sept., vi. 713–725. Consult: H. Marczali, *Ungarns Geschichte,* pp. 24–33, Berlin, 1882; Wattenbach, *DGQ,* ii (1886), 185, ii (1894), 209.

3. Gerard of La Sauve: French Benedictine reformer, founder of the congregation of Sauve-Majour in Guienne; d. 1098. Under his leadership, which lasted till his death, this reform congregation won considerable fame and attained a strength of seventy cloisters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. Cirot de la Ville, *Hist. de la congrégation de . la Grande Sauve,* 2 vols., Bordeaux, 1844; Moniquet, *S. Gérard de l'ordre de S. Bénoit,* Paris, 1895.

4. Gerard of Toul: Bishop of Toul (14 m. w. of Nancy); b. at Cologne c. 935; d. at Toul 994. He was made bishop of Toul by Archbishop Bruno, and deserves mention here as the restorer of the cathedral at Toul, and as the self-sacrificing shepherd of his diocese during the famine and pest of 981. (O. ZÖCKLER †.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The early *Vita* and the *Miracula* by Widric are in *ASB,* April, iii. 206–213, and, ed. Waitz, in *MGH, Script.,* iv (1841), 485–509. Consult Wattenbach, *DGQ,* ii (1886), 115, i (1893), 337, ii. 127–128.

GERASENES, ger″ą-sînz′: According to the best readings of Mark v. 1 and Luke viii. 26, the name of the people in whose region Jesus healed a demoniac, permitting the "legion of demons" to enter into a herd of swine. In Matt. viii. 28 "Gadarenes" is the preferable reading, and "Gergesenes" is also found. Gadara, the capital of Peræa, has been thought too far from the Sea of Galilee to satisfy the narrative, but its territory reached to the shores of the sea. A hill west of the sea, Jabal Kuran Jaradi, has been thought to retain the old name, changing Gadarenes into Garadenes. Gerasa can not be the modern Jerash, but may be Kersah, a ruined village on the left bank of the Wadi as-Samak about half-way between the northern and southern extremities of the Sea of Galilee, or as-Sur (connected with *kursi,* "seat") farther up the same wadi. See GAULANITIS; PERÆA.

GERBERON, zhār″be″rən′, **GABRIEL:** One of the most famous disciples of St. Augustine and one of the most profilic writers of his time; b. at St. Calais (95 m. s.w. of Paris), in Maine, Aug. 12, 1628; d. at the abbey of St. Denis, Paris, Mar. 29, 1711. He received an excellent education from the fathers of the Congregation of St. Maur, of which he became a member in 1648. He taught rhetoric, philosophy, and theology in different abbeys; but, developing too great a zeal for the doctrine of the "disciples of grace" and being suspected as a Jansenist, his superiors finally sent him to the abbey of St. Germain des Près at Paris, under supervision. After 1675 he was active in the abbey of Corbie

near Amiens. In 1676 his *Miroir de la piété chrétienne* appeared at Brussels, a work which several archbishops and writers criticized as a renewal of the five condemned sentences of Jansen; Gerberon defended his work in *Le Miroir sans tache* (Paris, 1680). The Jesuits and their partizans in his congregation denounced him in Paris for taking the part of the pope against the king in the disputes concerning the royal prerogative. Gerberon was threatened with arrest, but fled with the consent of his superior to the Spanish Netherlands. The Jansenist clergy called him to Holland, but owing to his attacks on the Protestants he was compelled to return to Brussels in 1690. In 1703 he was arrested, forced to sign the condemnation of the five sentences of Jansen, and delivered to his superiors for punishment; until 1707 he was kept a prisoner in Amiens. After he had given his signature, the pope allowed him to read mass. In Vincennes he was treated with greater severity; being stricken with paralysis, Cardinal Archbishop Noailles threatened to let him die " like a dog," without the Eucharist, if he did not sign certain further propositions expressing the cardinal's opinion. In 1710 he was handed over to his congregation. As soon as he learned that his signature was interpreted as a recantation of his doctrine, he wrote *Le Vain Triomphe des Jésuites*, but his superiors prevented its publication. On his death-bed he recalled all declarations, " wrested from his weakness by cunning and force," except the condemnation of the five sentences. Besides the works mentioned, he wrote *Apologia pro Ruperto abbate Tiutense* (Paris, 1669) against the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, *Defense de l'Église romaine contre les calomnies des protestants* (Cologne, 1688, 1691), and many other works, said to number 111 in all.

(C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Supplément au nécrologe de l'abbaye . de Port-Royal-des-Champs*, i. 498 sqq., Amsterdam, 1735; R. P. Tassin, *Gelehrtengeschichte der Congregation von St. Maur*, i. 505 sqq., Frankfort, 1773; *KL*, v. 350–353; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 539–540.

GERBERT, gār'bārt, **MARTIN:** Abbot of St. Blasien (St. Blaise) in the southern part of the Black Forest (20 m. s.e. of Freiburg), and one of the most learned ecclesiastics of the eighteenth century; b. at Horb-on-the-Neckar (31 m. s.w. of Stuttgart) Aug. 13, 1720; d. at his monastery May 3, 1793. He was educated at the Jesuit college of Freiburg, at Klingnau in Switzerland, and at the abbey of St. Blasien, where he was ordained priest in 1744, and chosen abbot in 1764. From 1759 to 1762 he traveled in Germany, Italy, and France, and published a Latin account of his travels (St. Blasien, 1765; Germ. transl., Ulm, 1767). He was a zealous investigator of the history of monasteries, especially in the Black Forest, and his *Historia nigræ sylvæ ordinis S. Benedicti* (3 vols., Cologne, 1783–88) contains much valuable information on this subject. He published also a *Codex epistolaris Rudolphi I.* (St. Blasien, 1772), and completed the *Taphographia principum Austriæ*, begun by Rustenus Heer, a former member of the chapter of St. Blasien (vol. iv. of Herrgott's *Monumenta domus Austriacæ*, Vienna, 1752). His favorite study, however, was the theory and history of music, and he enriched this field of literature with many valuable works: *De cantu et musica sacra* (2 vols., St. Blasien, 1774); *Monumenta veteris liturgiæ Alemannicæ* (2 vols., 1777–79); and *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica sacra* (3 vols., 1784). He wrote also several theological and ascetical treatises, one of which was directed against Jansenism.

(K. KLÜPFEL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Bader, *Fürstabt Martin Gerbert von St. Blasien*, Freiburg, 1875; *KL*, v. 353–356; *ADB*, viii. 725.

GERDES, gār'des, **DANIEL:** Professor of dogmatics and church history at the University of Groningen; b. at Bremen Apr. 16, 1698; d. at Groningen Feb. 11, 1765. He was the son of a respected merchant, studied theology in his native city and then in Utrecht under F. A. Lampe. In 1724 he became preacher at Wageningen in Holland, in 1726 professor of theology in Duisburg. From 1736 until his death he was professor at Groningen. His extensive scholarship and his piety made him the most distinguished personality of the university. In his *Doctrina gratiæ sive compendium theologiæ dogmaticæ* (Duisburg, 1734; Groningen, 1744) he shows himself a very moderate disciple of Cocceius. His real importance lay in the sphere of church history. He presented the growth of the Evangelical faith, especially of the Reformed faith, in his *Introductio in historiam Evangelii seculo XVI. passim per Europam renovati doctrinæque reformatæ* (4 vols., Groningen, 1744–1752) and *Scrinium antiquarium sive miscellanea Groningana nova ad historiam reformationis ecclesiasticam præcipue spectantia* (8 vols., Groningen and Bremen, 1761–65), and wrote also about the Reformation in Italy, in the diocese of Salzburg, and in Bremen. Many important documents are given in these works.

(E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A short autobiography exists in his *Miscellanea Duisbergensia*, i. 126 sqq., 1732 sqq. E. Hollebeek treated of his life in the Preface to Gerdes' *Specimen Italiæ reformatæ*, Leyden, 1765; A. J. Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek van der Nederlanden*, vii. 123 sqq.; *ADB*, viii. 730–731.

GEREON, SAINT. See THEBAN LEGION.

GERGESENES. See GERASENES.

GERHARD, gār'hārt, **JOHANN:** Lutheran dogmatician; b. at Quedlinburg (34 m. n.w. of Magdeburg), of distinguished family, Oct. 17, 1582; d. at Jena Aug. 17, 1637. At the age of fifteen he was afflicted with a serious illness and vowed to devote his life to the ministry if he should recover. Johann Arndt (q.v.), who preached at this time in Quedlinburg, took kindly to him and assisted him with his counsel. In 1599 he went to the University of Wittenberg and devoted himself to the study of philosophy and theology. Complying with the wish of a relative and contrary to his vow, he took up the study of medicine, but after the death of the relative resumed theology. He removed to Jena, but profited less from the lectures of the professors there than from private study of the Bible and the Church Fathers. In 1603 he became master of arts. At this time the fame of the theological faculty at Marburg

Life.

attracted him thither, and Winckelmann and Mentzer especially influenced him. When Hesse-Cassel, under Landgrave Maurice, accepted the Reformed doctrine he left Marburg and went back to Jena hoping to become professor. But Duke Casimir of Coburg, to whom he was highly recommended, entrusted him with the superintendency at Heldburg and made him doctor of theology. He was only twenty-four years old at this time. In 1615 the duke made him general superintendent at Coburg, and in this position he was commissioned to draw up a church order. His nature and talents, however, made him long for a professor's chair, and he received calls from different universities, but Duke Casimir considered a theologian of Gerhard's importance indispensable for his realm. At last, however, the opposition of the duke was overcome, and in 1616 Gerhard became professor at Jena.

His Character and Activities.

All the different phases of the academic teacher seemed to find their full development in Gerhard, and his lectures attracted crowds of students. He loved his students, in case of sickness went to their residence, and assisted them in all their troubles. His contemporaries considered him the greatest theologian of his time. He received no less than twenty-four calls from different universities while at Jena, but he had no reason to leave. Although his salary was not large, he amassed a not inconsiderable fortune from emoluments accruing from his connection with princes and noblemen, and moreover, he lived in peace with all his colleagues. His usefulness showed itself also in the domain of practical church work and even of politics. The theologians of Saxony had brought about conventions from which they hoped to develop gradually a supreme tribunal of the Lutheran Church at the birthplace of the Reformation. Important conventions were held in 1621, 1624, 1628, and 1630, and in all of them Gerhard held a leading position. To many princes he was an oracle in questions of all kinds, such as the recommendations of church or school officers, princely match-makings or sponsorships, arbitration in disputes, and mediation in pecuniary affairs. Indeed, he himself sometimes gave financial aid to princes. His health was rather delicate and considerably affected by his numerous journeys on business.

Writings.

In the sphere of dogmatics two works especially made Gerhard's name famous. One of them was the *Confessio catholica, in qua doctrina catholica et evangelica, quam ecclesiæ Augustanæ confessioni addictæ profitentur, ex Romano-catholicorum scriptorum suffragiis confirmatur* (4 parts, Frankfort and Leipsic, 1634–37), based upon the *Catalogus testium veritatis* of Flacius. It is more comprehensive than its title denotes, being at the same time an extensive apology and polemic of the Evangelical creed. The first part is general and treats the *principia et media nostræ et pontificiæ religionis*. The other three volumes treat the disputed articles of faith in the order of Bellarmine. the controversialist *par excellence*. But the chief work which established Gerhard's theological reputation is his *Loci theologici;* he began this at the age of twenty-seven and wrote the last and ninth volume in 1622. In 1657 his son, Johann Ernst, prepared a new edition, and another (22 vols.) was issued by J. F. Cotta, professor of dogmatics in Tübingen in 1762–89 (later eds. by E. Preuss, 33 vols., Berlin, 1863–75; 9 vols., Leipsic, 1885), Gerhard's work is distinguished from that of his predecessors like Chemnitz and Hutten by a certain progress in method. He made a more logical arrangement of the *loci* and distinguished different groups. He puts the doctrine concerning Scripture before his system proper, because the dogma of the canon is not really an article of faith, but the basis of the articles of faith. Over against the infallibility of the pope he sets the infallibility of Scripture. But here it becomes evident that the strongest side of the orthodox faith is also its weakest side, for in order to save the authority of Scripture Gerhard had to maintain a theory of inspiration that included even the Hebrew vowel points. This weak point was cleverly detected by the Jesuits. Nevertheless the work may be justly characterized as the consummation of Lutheran dogmatic theology as initiated by Melanchthon. Besides these two principal works may be mentioned an exegetical writing entitled *Harmonia evangelistarum Chemnitio-Lyseriana a Jo. Gerhardo continuata et iusto commentario illustrata* (3 parts, Jena, 1626–27). Another production contributing to his fame was the *Meditationes sacræ*, which he wrote as a student in 1606. It consists of fifty-one devotional meditations, has passed through innumerable editions, and even recently several translations have appeared (*Fourteen Meditations*, London, 1846). A work of a similar nature and similar success was his *Exercitium pietatis quotidianum quadripartitum* (Coburg, 1612–15). His *Schola pietatis* (1622–23) was less successful. His *Enchiridion consolatorium* was translated into German and edited in 1877 by C. J. Böttcher (Leipsic, 1877). There appeared recently (Leipsic, 1898) *D. Joannis Gerhardihomiliæ XXXVI, seu meditationes breves diebus dominicis atque festis accommodatæ e manuscriptis Gerhardinis ab illustrissima bibliotheca Gothana asservatis; primum edidit Dr. G. Berbig.* In his *Methodus studii theologici* (1620) he touched the sphere of isagogics, and emphasized especially the study of Holy Scripture.

(Johannes Kunze.)

Bibliography: A highly satisfactory biography of Gerhard, based upon sources, some of which are no longer accessible, was prepared by E. R. Fischer, Leipsic, 1723, 1727. Consult: W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, i. 246 sqq.. Berlin, 1854; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, i. 371 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; E. Troeltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei J. Gerhard und Melanchthon*, Göttingen, 1891.

GERHARD TONQUE. See John, Saint, Order of Hospitalers of.

GERHARDT, gār'hārt, **PAULUS:** The foremost of German hymn-writers; b. at Gräfenhainichen (10 m. s. w.of Wittenberg), Electoral Saxony, Mar. 12, 1607; d. at Lübben (40 m. s.w. of Frankfort-on-the-Oder) June 7, 1676. He studied at Wittenberg from 1628, but, probably owing to the disorders of war, it was not until 1651 that he

obtained his first charge as provost in Mittenwalde. In 1657 he was called to the church of St. Nicholas in Berlin. When the great elector of Brandenburg required that all the clergy should pledge themselves by a declaration to follow his edicts of 1662 and 1664, Gerhardt refused to sign the declaration (Feb., 1666) and was dismissed from his office. So far as the content of the declaration was concerned, Gerhardt could have signed it without hesitation. His was not a disputatious nature and he had never used contumelious expressions in his sermons, at which the declaration was specially aimed. The reason for his refusal clearly lay in the fact that he regarded the declaration as an infringement upon his right to uphold his Lutheran convictions, his scrupulous conscience making him feel that all yielding in matters relating to the doctrines of the Reformation was wrong. For this reason he could not decide to resume his office, although his dismissal was recalled and the elector agreed that he should not sign the declaration (1667). In 1668 he was called to Lübben as archdeacon, where he spent the last seven years of a life consecrated to good works.

Gerhardt is the most gifted author of religious songs whom the German Church has ever known. In him, more than in any other, all the requisites for this style of poetry are united. He possessed a firm conviction of the objective truth of the Christian doctrine of salvation and also a genuine sentiment for all that is purely human; deep Christian feeling coupled with sterling good sense; and a fresh and healthy appreciation of life in nature and in mind. In addition to all this, his hymns possess a beauty of form in which the influence of the progress in technique initiated by Opitz can be traced. In the history of religious poetry Gerhardt marks the beginning of a new era; with him sacred poetry assumes a strongly personal character. This was later corrupted by mystical and rationalistic tendencies, but with Gerhardt it always remained in full accord with the objective realities of religious faith. It is characteristic that out of his 120 hymns not less than sixteen begin with " I," and of the rest more than sixty concern only his own heart and God. In the hymns of the Reformation period the Church is the exclusive subject and object of religious song and the personal note is only rarely sounded. This quality of Gerhardt's hymns is, however, merely the concrete individual form in which Christian faith and Christian life, a common possession of Christ's Church, find expression. As another characteristic of Gerhardt's hymns may be noted the purely human sentiment that animates them. He sings of summer and harvest, of travel and marriage, indeed of the whole of life in nature (cf. his hymn to summer, " Go forth, my heart, and seek for joy "). His whole view of nature, and especially of nature's accord with religious life, is absolutely unaffected and therefore harmonious. In spite of his delicacy of feeling, however, Gerhardt did not altogether escape the influence of the taste of his time; there are parts of his hymns which must to-day be considered harsh and even tasteless. Not satisfied, however, with removing these real blemishes, the critics of a later time, in their emendations, ruthlessly trod under foot all that was most beautiful in the garden of Gerhardt's poesy and transplanted thither their own thistles. This age has given proof of a better historical sense by turning back lovingly to the " unadulterated " Gerhardt.

Gerhardt's Hymns.

Gerhardt did not himself collect or publish his hymns. Most of them appeared for the first time in Johann Crüger's *Praxis pietatis melica* (1st and 2d eds. not known; 3d ed., Berlin, 1648). The first complete collection was the work of Johann Georg Ebeling, in ten parts, each containing twelve hymns with tunes (Frankfort-on-the-Oder and Berlin, 1666 and 1667). Among later editions that of J. H. Feustking (Zerbst, 1707) deserves attention because the editor claims that he has corrected the text " according to a copy revised by the author's very hand." Of the more recent critical editions mention may be made of that by J. F. Bachmann (Berlin, 1866), and that of Karl Goedeke (*Deutsche Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*, vol. xii., Leipsic, 1877). The best is the latest edition by August Ebeling (Hanover and Leipsic, 1898), in which for the first time the fifth edition of the *Praxis pietatis melica* could be used for the restoration of the text (cf. Ebeling's essay, *Wo ist der Originaltext der Paul Gerhardt'schen Lieder zu finden?* in O. Lyon's *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, xi., 1897, pp. 745–783).

CARL BERTHEAU.

Many of Gerhardt's hymns have been incorporated in English collections of hymns or of devotional poetry, and one of them, " O sacred Head now wounded," an adaptation of a hymn attributed to Bernard of Clairvaux (q.v.), is widely known and frequently sung. Other familiar ones begin," Oh! how shall I receive thee; " " Commit thou all thy griefs," and " Give to the winds thy fears." More than thirty of his hymns are classical. His English translators include John Wesley, Miss C. Winkworth, James W. Alexander, and John Kelly, who has furnished a complete translation, *Paul Gerhardt's Spiritual Songs* (London, 1867).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The editions of the poems and hymns hy J. F. Bachmann, K. Goedeke, and A. Eberling contain discussions of the life of Gerhardt. For his life consult also: E. G. Roth, *Paul Gerhardt*, Leipsic, 1829; F. W. Krummacher, in Piper's *Evangelischer Kalender*, pp. 204 sqq., Berlin, 1866; E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, iii. 297–327, Stuttgart, 1867; K. Goedeke, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, iii. 182, Dresden, 1887; *ADB*, viii. 774–783; E. Achelis, in the *Blätter für Hymnologie*, 1884, pp. 51 sqq., 71 sqq. More popular lives are those by C. E. Wildenhahn, Leipsic, 1845, and A. Stein, Halle, 1897. Consult also S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 21 et passim, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 409–412. The celebration in Germany in 1907 of the 300th anniversary of Gerhardt's birth educed a number of monographs of great merit, including: P. Wernle's *Paulus Gerhardt*, Tübingen, 1907; G. Kawerau's address, Halle, 1907; and H. Petrich, *Paul Gerhardt, seine Lieder und seine Zeit*, Gütersloh, 1907; R. Hupfeld, *Die Ethik Johann Gerhards. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Lutherischen Ethik*, Berlin, 1908.

GERHART, EMANUEL VOGEL: German Reformed; b. at Freeburg, Pa., June 13, 1817; d. at Lancaster, Pa., May 6, 1904. He was graduated from Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa. (A.B., 1838), and Mercersburg Theological Seminary (1841). After being pastor at Gettysburg, Pa. (1843–49), and missionary to the German immigrants at Cincinnati, O. (1849–51), he was professor of theology and president of Heidelberg College, Tiffin, O. (1851–55); and president of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. (1855–66), but on the reconstruction of the faculty of that institution in 1866 became vice-president and professor of moral philosophy. In 1868 he was appointed professor of systematic and practical theology in the Reformed Church Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., and

held that position until his death. He wrote *Philosophy and Logic* (Philadelphia, 1858) and *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (New York, 1891). He likewise edited the *Mercersburg Review* for several years, as well as F. A. Rauch's *Inner Life of the Christian* (Philadelphia, 1856).

GERHOH, gār'hō (*Gerohus*), **OF REICHERSBERG:** Writer on church discipline; b. at Polling (30 m. s.w. of Munich), Bavaria, 1093; d. at Reichersberg (on the Inn, 40 m. s.w. of Linz), Upper Austria, June 27, 1169. He was educated in Moosburg, Freising, and Hildesheim and became canon and teacher at the cathedral school in Augsburg. Offended by the neglect of church discipline and canonical rules he retired into the monastery of Raitenbuch, but was recalled to Augsburg by Bishop Hermann. Again, however, he was offended by the worldliness in the bishop's surroundings and reentered Raitenbuch. Bishop Conrad of Salzburg commissioned him twice to go to Rome and discuss with Honorius II. the discipline of the clergy. In his own monastery (Raitenbuch) his discipline was opposed, and so Cuno, the new bishop of Regensburg, called him into his district. In 1132 after Cuno's death Conrad of Salzburg appointed him prior of the monastery of Reichersberg on the Inn, and here Gerhoh was active until the end of his life.

This activity was twofold, pertaining to both ecclesiastical polity and dogmatics. His work and attitude toward the former was conditioned by the circumstances of the time. The disputes concerning Investiture (q.v.) had not yet been settled; the system of Hildebrand made progress, attacking married priests and simony in every form. Pope Gregory VII., the promoter of strict discipline, became Gerhoh's ideal. It was necessary to put an end to the abuses practised in the disposal of church property and to form the life of the clergy according to fixed rules, and Gerhoh fought with angry zeal for these ideals. He initiated his warfare about 1130 with his *De œdificio Dei;* then followed a treatise on the difference between secular and regular clergy. But his most important work is his *Investigatio* (1162). The first book of this work is historical, then follow discussions on theology and discipline. Gerhoh censures fearlessly the barter of ecclesiastical offices and the avarice of Rome, the abuse of exemptions, the self-enrichment of nuncios and legates and the papal schism. Against the arrogance of the popes in usurping worldly government he maintained that popedom and empire, the two great lights, the pillars of the temple, should stand side by side without any confusion of their respective powers. This position led him to the ideal demand that the Church should be satisfied with tithes and free gifts and renounce all worldly and princely power. With growing age Gerhoh's ideals were somewhat subdued. Although he stood altogether alone in his ideals at his time, they may be regarded as a significant prophecy pointing to later times in which the separation of spiritual and worldly power has become a necessity.

Gerhoh's dogmatic activity was carried on at the time of the reaction against the French dialecticians such as Roscellin, Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers, who in Christological questions were not only nominalists, but often almost Nestorians by separating the natures of Christ and approaching very closely adoptionism. Representatives of this view were also in Germany, among them Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg and Provost Folmar of Triefenstein. In 1158 a conference took place in Bamberg at which Gerhoh was accused of heresy. In the first chapter of his book *De gloria et honore filii dei* he defends his Christological position against the attacks of Folmar. He calls the man Jesus also the natural and only son of God since he entered the glory of the Father. In his eternal birth he has no mother, in his temporal no father. It is on account of the danger of Nestorianism that Gerhoh clings so firmly to the glorification of the human nature in Christ. Then he refutes the objections against the unity of the divine and human nature in Christ, appealing to the Fathers, especially Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. In his *Contra duos hæreses* he combated the view that heretical priests could successfully bring about the transformation of the body of Christ in the mass. He held that Christ is not locally circumscribed, that he is everywhere. The body of Christ has grown in such a way that it fills the whole universe. The bishop of Bamberg accused Gerhoh of heresy because he taught that in the Eucharist the divinity is at the same time the whole humanity. The bishop held that Christ after ascension is still a creature as man, and his reproach of Gerhoh was not without justice.

Gerhoh's path of life was troubled. At synods and diets he was an authority on ecclesiastical law and polity and well known at the courts of popes and emperors; but as a dogmatician he clung so tenaciously to his position that his opponents, Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, and Peter Lombard, had to quit the field. In later years he had to encounter another storm. When the emperor tried to put an end to the schism by enforcing the acknowledgment of Alexander's opponent as pope, Archbishop Conrad did not yield and war broke out at Salzburg. Gerhoh's monastery was burned and pillaged. (R. Rocholl †.)

Bibliography: His works are in *MPL*, cxciii.–cxciv.; *Selecti libelli*, ed. E. Sackur, are in *MGH, Lib. de lite*, ii (1897), 131–525. For his life consult H. F. A. Nobbe, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg*, Leipsic, 1881; W. Ribbeck, in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, xxiii (1883), 3 sqq., xxv (1885), 556 sqq.; *KL*, v. 378–391; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. iv. passim (uses much of Gerhoh's material); Moeller, *Christian Church*, pp. 295, 307, 318–319, 379.

GERIZIM. See Palestine; Samaritans.

GERLACH, gār'lāh, **OTTO VON:** German theologian; b. in Berlin Apr. 12, 1801; d. there Oct. 24, 1849. Coming from a noble and influential family, he was at first intended for a political career, and took up the study of jurisprudence at Heidelberg and Göttingen. In 1820 he returned to Berlin, where he devoted himself to theology, and he studied also at the Seminary at Wittenberg, 1825–26. In 1834 he was appointed pastor of the church of St. Elizabeth, near Berlin, and in 1847, court preacher. Before his appointment to a pastorate, he had been active in foreign missionary work, having established (1824) the *Berliner Gesellschaft zur Ver-*

breitung des Evangeliums unter den Heiden, and (1828) a seminary for the instruction of missionaries. After his appointment he took an equally lively interest in home missions, and founded various societies for Christian work as well as many charitable institutions. His zeal earned him the name "the Wesley of Berlin," bestowed upon him by Tholuck. The translation of a sermon of Wesley's was his first literary work; he also translated *The Saints' Rest* and others of Baxter's works. As a result of a journey to England, undertaken by order of King Frederick William IV., he published *Amtliche Bericht über den Zustand der anglikanischen Kirche in ihren verschiedenen Gliederungen im Jahre 1842* (Berlin, 1845), a work which, although expressive of admiration for the power and activity of the Church of England, nevertheless recognizes the twofold danger of ecclesiastical partizanship and the leaven of Puseyism. Gerlach was the author also of a commentary on the Bible (6 vols., 1847–1853), which was long a very popular work.

(R. Kögel †.)

Bibliography: A notice of his life is prefixed to his *Predigten*, ed. G. Seegemund, vol. iv., part i., Berlin, 1850.

GERLACH (*Gerlacus*), **PETERS (PETRI, PETERSZ):** Ascetic writer belonging to the Brethren of the Common Life (q.v.); b. at Deventer (8 m. n. of Zutphen), Holland, 1378; d. at Windesheim (14 m. n. of Deventer) Nov. 18, 1411. His mother was a woman of wealth who spent much money on the enlargement of the monastery of Windesheim, and through her he met Geert Groote (q.v.) and was kindly received as a scholar by Florentius Radewyns. While the pupils were presenting a mystery-play in the church, Gerlach was persuaded by Florentius to enter the monastery of the Brethren. How long he remained there is uncertain, but he felt more at home at Windesheim, and Florentius made the necessary arrangements for his entrance there. In his new home the youth was universally popular, and was an especial protégé of the director, Vos von Heusden. The trend of Gerlach's mind was contemplative rather than mystical, and he recorded his thoughts on slips of paper, generally writing in the vernacular. Shortly before his death he begged that his meditations be destroyed, but his prior declined to accede to his request, and they were accordingly preserved. His writings, according to Johann Busch (*Chronicon Windeshemense*, ed. Grube, Halle, 1886, 157 sqq.), were collected by Johann Schutken at the instance of Vos, and were as follows: *Breviloquium*, composed before 1403, and containing edifying thoughts by himself and others to a member of the brotherhood (ed. W. Moll, in *Kerkhistorisch Archief*, ii., Amsterdam, 1859, 179 sqq., on the basis of a Brussels manuscript; an excellent text was discovered by Hirsche at Wolfenbüttel); *Epistola Teutonicalis*, addressed to his sister Lubbe, and containing translations from the *Breviloquium* (ed. W Moll, ut sup., 202 sqq.) and *Soliloquium* (also called *Exercitia*), his most important work and the one which gained him the name of *alter Thomas*. It is a soliloquy of the soul with God, lifting the soul out of the diversions of worldly life. It was collected by John Schutken, and was highly esteemed in Port Royal, in addition to winning the praise of Poiret and Tersteegen (Cologne, 1616; new ed., Amsterdam, 1711, ed. J. Strange, Cologne, 1849; Germ. transl. by G. Tersteegen, 1734, 1845, and by N. Casseder, in his *Mystisch-asketische Bibliothek*, i., Frankfort, 1829, 1849; Dutch transl. by J. van Gorcum, 1621; all the editions contain many variants). Together with the *Breviloquium* noted above, Hirsche discovered at Wolfenbüttel a *Soliloquium* which presents many deviations, but is very old, dating from 1424. The *Ignitum cum Deo colloquium* and *De libertate spiritus cum exercitiis eo spectantibus* mentioned by Valerius Andreas were unknown to Busch. Moll and Acquoy regard them as independent works, but Hirsche more correctly considers them recensions of the works already mentioned. Since Gerlach wrote much in the vernacular, he belongs, like Hendrik Mande, to the first and best prose-writers of the fifteenth century.

L. Schulze.

Bibliography: The chief source is J. Busch, *Chronicon Windeshemense*, ed. K. Grube, Halle, 1886. The subject was first scientifically treated by W. Moll in N. C. Kist and W. Moll, *Kerkhistorisch Archief*, ii. 145–146, Amsterdam, 1859, where three of Gerlach's five writings are reproduced, cf. W. Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland*, ii., part 2, pp. 208–236, 363 sqq., part 3, pp. 27 sqq., 41, Utrecht, 1865–71; J. G. R. Acquoy, *Het Klooster te Windesheim*, Amsterdam, 1875; A. Auger, *Étude sur les mystiques des Pays-Bas . . in Mémoires par l'academie royale . de Belgique*, xlvi. 300 sqq., Brussels, 1892; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, i. 367, London, 1879.

GERLACHER (GERNOLT), THEOBALD. See Billican, Theobald.

GERLE, zhārl, **CHRISTOPHE ANTOINE:** French religious enthusiast; b. at Riom (85 m. w. of Lyons) Oct. 25, 1736; d. in Paris Nov. 17, 1801. He entered the order of Carthusians, became prior of the convent of Port-Sainte-Marie, and represented the clergy of Riom in the States-General in 1789. In the famous Tennis Court session he exhibited so much patriotic fervor that David gave him a prominent place in his painting, *Le Serment du Jeu de Paume*. He was a member of the Constitutional Assembly, and on Apr. 12, 1790, vainly urged that body to proclaim Roman Catholicism as the only religion recognized by the French nation. He became a follower of Catherine Théot, a fanatical old woman who called herself the mother of God. As a supporter of Robespierre with other Théotists, he was imprisoned May 16, 1794, but was released on the advent of the Directory. He was afterward employed in the Ministry of the Interior and contributed some articles to the *Messager du Soir*.

Bibliography: J. Michelet, *Hist. de la revolution française*, vol. vii., Paris, 1853; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, v. 548–549.

GERMAN BAPTISTS, GERMAN BAPTIST BRETHREN. See Dunkers.

GERMAN CATHOLICISM.

Origin. Johannes Ronge (§ 1).
Johann Czerski (§ 2).
Growth and Organization (§ 3).
Absorption by the Free Protestant Congregations (§ 4).
Reasons for Failure (§ 5).

By "German Catholicism" (*Deutschkatholicismus*) is meant a reform movement which arose within the Roman Catholic Church in Germany in

the middle of the nineteenth century, led to the formation of separate congregations, and ultimately entered into such close relations with the Protestant bodies called *Lichtfreunde* (see Free Congregations in Germany) that the two movements at present can be distinguished only in certain parts of Germany. The tendency was promoted, on the one hand, by the after-effects of the age of the Enlightenment and the liberal spirit which passed over Europe from about 1830; on the other hand, by the spread of Ultramontanism within the Roman Church. The immediate occasion was the solemn exhibition of the seamless coat of Christ by Bishop Arnoldi in Treves in 1844 (see Treves, Holy Coat of); this was intended to demonstrate that the Roman Catholic population rendered unconditional obedience to the leadership of their clergy, a principle which had already been illustrated by the victory of Archbishop Droste-Vischering of Cologne over the Prussian government (see Droste-Vischering, Clemens August, Freiherr von), and the intention was fully realized. But if this celebration was a great demonstration of the power of the Roman Church over its members, it had also the effect of a challenge on circles which in spirit had outgrown the tutelage of the clergy. This explains the publication of an open letter to Bishop Arnoldi on Oct. 15, 1844; it was a trenchant protest against the "idolatrous celebration" (*Goetzenfest*) of the Roman hierarchy which inveigled the credulous multitude into directing "those feelings of reverence which we owe to God alone, to an article of clothing, a work that human hands have made." The contradiction between the veneration of relics and the spirit of Christianity is sharply emphasized, and the German people is exhorted "to check the tyrannical power of the Roman hierarchy." The author of the letter was Johannes Ronge, a priest, thirty-one years old (b. Oct. 16, 1813), who, because of an article "Rome and the Cathedral Chapter of Breslau," had been suspended from office in 1843 and since then had acted as a teacher in Laurahütte in Upper Silesia. When Ronge refused to retract his open letter, he was excommunicated and degraded, Dec. 4, 1844, by the suffragan bishop Latussek of Breslau. Ronge left the Roman Church but continued the literary controversy in a series of pamphlets, in which he demanded the abolition of celibacy, of auricular confession, and of Latin as the ecclesiastical language, and called for the formation of a German Catholic Church.

1. Origin. Johannes Ronge.

Another priest, in the neighboring province of Posen, independently of him had already put these thoughts into practise. Johann Czerski (b. May 12, 1813) had come to doubt many dogmas while in the bishop's seminary, and was confirmed in these doubts by studying the Holy Scripture while vicar in Posen. When he had been transferred to Schneidemühl, where, even before his arrival, similar ideas had been spreading, he went further in this direction, married, gave up his ecclesiastical position, and with his followers left the Roman Church in order to organize themselves as a "Christian Catholic" Church. The first congregation was founded in Breslau in 1845, on the basis of an Apostles' Creed modernized by Ronge as follows:

2. Johann Czerski.

> I believe in God, the Father, who through his almighty word created the world and rules it in wisdom, righteousness and love. I believe in Jesus Christ our Savior, who by his teachings, his life, and his death has ransomed us from the bondage of sin. I believe in the sway (*Walten*) of the Holy Ghost on earth. I believe in a holy, universal Christian Church, the communion of the faithful, the forgiveness of sins, and an eternal life.

At the same time the congregation proclaimed the principle of complete freedom of conscience and the freedom of scientific investigation.

There now followed in quick succession the founding of congregations in the other parts of Germany. To bind them together was the purpose of the "First General Church Convention of the German Catholic Church," held in Leipsic Mar. 23–26, 1845. According to the official minutes fifteen congregations were here represented, thirty-one delegates being present. As the title of the new Church the name "German Catholic Church" was adopted. As to its teaching, it was resolved: "the foundation of the Christian faith for us shall be Holy Scripture solely and alone, the construction and interpretation whereof is left free to reason penetrated and moved by the Christian idea." A creed was set up to show the content of the doctrines of the faith, which was an abbreviation of the confession adopted in Breslau. The demand of Czerski that the divinity of Christ should be added thereto was not complied with; moreover, the primacy of the pope, the hierarchy, auricular confession, compulsory celibacy, the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics and images, indulgences, etc., were rejected. But two sacraments were recognized, baptism and the Lord's Supper, the latter under both kinds. Regulations were also made concerning divine worship, which should be held in the German language without the use of the canon of the mass. Presbyterial organization was decided on for the congregations, which at the same time received the right to elect their own ministers and standing committees.

3. Growth and Organization.

It seemed as if a great day was dawning for German Catholicism when Ronge began his agitational journeys through Germany. They became triumphal processions. At the second German Catholic ecclesiastical convention of 1847 there were already 259 congregations with eighty-eight ministers. The movement attracted notice even in foreign countries. Ronge received resolutions of approval from the United States; a Free Catholic congregation was founded in New York in 1846; in subsequent years ministers who had emigrated from Germany founded similar ones in St. Louis and Philadelphia. English, Irish and French Unitarians showed their interest in what was going on in Germany, as did the Arminians of Holland.

Friendly relations soon arose between the German Catholic congregations and the free Protestant congregations which were founded about the same time (see Free Congregations in Germany). The friendship grew so that in May, 1850, the third

German Catholic council and the third synod of the free Protestant congregations met in Leipsic for negotiations with each other. There were here represented about 100 German Catholic congregations and about thirty free Protestant ones. The result was the formation of the "Religious Society of Free Congregations" (*Religionsgesellschaft freier Gemeinden*), which means that the German Catholic congregations gave up their Roman Catholic character and their creed and melted away in the Protestant free religious movement. This union was the end of German Catholicism as an independent party building upon Catholic foundations; the confessional element, which had hitherto still persisted in it though in a weakened form, was sacrified in the interests of the more highly valued element of freedom.

4. Absorption by the Free Protestant Congregations.

This union was not adopted without objections in the meeting, and not all the congregations accepted it. There still exist to-day in the Kingdom of Saxony several German Catholic congregations comprising more than three thousand persons; that at Leipsic shows a vigorous increase (1866, 407 persons, 1903 almost 1,400). It can not be determined how many of the free congregations outside Saxony may still be counted as German Catholic; their names are too indefinite. In general it may be said that the title of "German Catholic" is used at present by the congregations of Western and Southern Germany belonging to the League of Free Religious Congregations. In isolated instances there occur titles like "Christian Catholic" (*Christkatholisch*), "Free Christian" (*Frei-christlich*), and even the name "Free Evangelical Catholic" (*Frei evangelisch-katholisch*) is found in Königsberg, as an attempt to express absolute superiority to confessionalism. According to a list of the League of Free Religious Congregations (*Bund freireligiöser Gemeinden*) of 1896, fifty-nine congregations belonged at that time, fourteen of them mentioning in their self-chosen title their relationship to Catholicism.

Within German Catholicism Czerski tried at the start to maintain connection with churchly Christianity, but he was not able to make his influence felt alongside that of Ronge. From objecting to compulsory dogmas they went on apace to thrusting all dogmas aside, and so to a breach with the Christian faith, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. Many who had joined the movement at the start because they hoped from it a purification and reformation of the Roman Church, now withdrew; such were Anton Theiner, professor of Catholic theology, and M. E. Regenbrecht, professor of canon law, both in Breslau. Very soon it became evident that Ronge merely had the ability to summon to the first attack on the Roman Church and to stir up the masses as an agitator, but that he did not have the power of founding a new Church. His lack of capacity was soon recognized even by those of his own party; he died in Vienna Oct. 26, 1887, a forgotten man. Czerski had long been of no public significance when death reached him Dec. 22, 1893.

5. Reasons for Failure.

At the start German Catholicism was not without certain prospects, for it voiced demands and represented ideas which corresponded to the mood of the times and contained much that was good. But that which Ronge and Czerski lacked was that wherein the entire movement was deficient, viz., the power to proceed from negative criticism of the faults of the Roman Church to the formation of a purer Catholic Church. This impotence was rooted in the lack of religious productivity. The German Catholic movement brought forth not a single personality able to lead others as a prophet. Though it may also be granted that persecution by the civil power was not without influence on the decline of the movement, nevertheless in the last analysis the decisive reasons for failure lie in its own make-up. For but a few years it was a danger to the Roman Church; after it had amalgamated with the free Protestant congregations, it needed no longer to be feared.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Kampe, *Geschichte der religiösen Bewegung der neuern Zeit*, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1852–60; idem, *Das Wesen des Deutschkatholicismus*, Tübingen, 1850; H. Schmid, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Munich, 1874; H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, ii. 525 sqq., Münster, 1903; G. Tschirn, *Zur 60-jährigen Geschichte der freireligiösen Bewegung*, Bamberg, 1904. For review of literature consult *Jenaische allgemeine Litteraturzeitung*, 1846-47; T. Bruns in C. Häfner, *Neues Repertorium für die theologische Litteratur und kirchliche Statistik*, vol. v., 1846.

GERMAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH DIET. See CHURCH DIET, GERMAN EVANGELICAL.

GERMAN EVANGELICAL PROTESTANT CHURCH: A name given collectively to a number of independent German churches, mostly west of the Alleghany Mountains, holding the general position of the Protestant Union, German (q.v.), represented by two associations named respectively "Union of Ministers of the German Evangelical Protestant Church of North America" and "Evangelical Protestant Preachers' Conference of North America." The first, formed in 1885, succeeded the defunct "Protestant Union," and aimed to furnish a representation of the churches interested, to preserve their independence and mutual interests, and to increase the efficiency of the ministers. It has three districts, Pittsburg, Cincinnati, and Western, with a central executive board of three members, and reports thirty-four churches and as many ministers. The second association, holding essentially the same position, was formed in 1896, and has twelve ministers and fourteen congregations. Besides the churches represented in the associations named, there are a number of independent congregations, the ministers of which are unaffiliated, the number and membership of which is not known, but the latter may reach 20,000. The fundamental principles are practically those of the United Evangelical Church of Prussia of 1817. Its religious foundation is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the interpretation of which is left to the judgment of the believer, guided by the Christian idea. The associations maintain an orphan's home and a home for the aged near Pittsburg, Pa., have a ministers' seminary, aid in the support of the Protes-

tant Orphan's Home in Cincinnati and St. Louis, and give occasional assistance to other benevolent institutions. The publications consist chiefly of aids to church services and devotion. Its periodicals are: the *Kirchenzeitung*, monthly at Cincinnati and weekly at Pittsburg; the *Christliche Jugendfreund*, a weekly and semimonthly paper for Sunday-schools; and the *Protestantische Volks-Kalender*, an annual. H. K. CARROLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. K. Carroll, in *American Church History Series*, i. 155, New York, 1896.

GERMAN EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA: An organization founded at Gravois Settlement, near St. Louis, Mo., Oct. 15, 1840, by six German ministers. The name Der deutsche evangelische Kirchenverein des Westens was then chosen. Owing to the expansion of the Synod this was changed in 1866 to Synod of the West and again in 1877 to its present name. It represents in the United States the State Church of Prussia, which is a union of Lutheran and Reformed elements (see PRUSSIA). Its creed and mission are stated in §§ 2 and 3 of its constitution: "The German Evangelical Synod of North America, as a part of the Evangelical Church, understands by 'Evangelical Church' that ecclesiastical body, which acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and as the only and infallible criterion of faith and life and accepts the interpretation given in the symbolic books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, the most important of which are: the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechism and the Heidelberg Catechism in so far as these agree; but in their points of difference the German Evangelical Synod adheres strictly to the passages of Holy Scripture pertaining thereunto and avails itself of that liberty of conscience prevailing in the Evangelical Church."

"The object and purpose of the German Evangelical Synod in general is the advancement and extension of the Kingdom of God, but especially the establishment and expansion of the Evangelical Church among the German population of the United States of America."

The Synod is divided into eighteen districts, which hold annual conferences. The general conference of the body convenes every four years, to which each district sends delegates, one for every twelve ministers and one lay delegate for every twelve congregations. A president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer are the officers of the Synod. The various branches of synodical work are controlled by separate boards of directors elected by the General Synod. Its agencies include a Home Mission Board which ministers to 102 congregations and expends upward of $25,000 annually; a Church Extension Fund which assists in the erection of churches by loaning money at low rates of interest; a Relief Fund for the aid of invalid and superannuated pastors, teachers and their widows and orphans; a foreign mission board which conducts work at four principal stations and forty-one outlying stations in India and reports 3,088 members; an immigrant mission operated at Baltimore, Md., since 1886; deaconesses' homes and hospitals at St. Louis, Mo., Indianapolis, and Evansville, Ind., Cincinnati, O., and Lincoln, Ill.; homes for epileptics at Marthasville and St. Charles, Mo.; orphanages at St. Louis, Mo., Hoyleton and Chicago, Ill. —also at Detroit, Mich., and Bensenville, Ill., with homes for old people at the last two places; and the Eden Publishing House (and book-store) at St. Louis, with a branch at Chicago, the whole valued at $143,775, with net proceeds of $37,000 annually, devoted to carrying on the work of the Synod in its various branches. There are 650 parochial schools with 25,777 scholars, instructed by 110 professional teachers and 571 pastors, also 1,044 Sunday-schools with 10,752 teachers and 110,385 scholars. The theological seminary, Eden College, is located near Wellston, St. Louis County, Mo. It was founded in 1850 near Marthasville, Mo., and removed in 1883 to its present location. It has a three years' course, four professors and sixty-seven students. At Elmhurst, Ill., a suburb of Chicago, is located a proseminary, having a five-year course, with 105 students and seven professors. While German is predominantly the language used in the churches and schools, English is also employed in church service and religious instruction and a few English churches have been organized in the last few years. The official organ is *Der Friedensbote*, a weekly with circulation of 27,334 copies. Other publications are: *Messenger of Peace*, *Theologische Zeitschrift*, *Jugendfreund*, *Kinderzeitung*, and *Evangelical Companion*. The Church began with six ministers, twelve churches, and 353 communicants. The statistics of 1907 give 974 ministers, 1,262 congregations, 1,095 churches, 654 school buildings, 237,321 communicants, value of church property $8,214,391.38, contributions for general purposes, in 1905, $119,233.21. PAUL IRION.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Shory, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Synode von Nord America*, St. Louis, 1889; *Evangelical Catechism*, ib. 1892; *Evangelischer Kalender* (annual).

GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH. See REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

GERMAN SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS. See COMMUNISM, II., 5.

GERMANUS, jer-mê'nus, SAINT, OF AUXERRE (St. Germain d'Auxerre): Bishop of Auxerre; b., according to a life claiming to be by his scholar, Constantius of Lyons, but thought by some to be later, at Auxerre c. 380; d. at Ravenna July 31, 448. He was of good family, received an excellent education in Gaul and Rome, married, and entered upon a prosperous and honorable career as lawyer and public official. Amator, bishop of Auxerre, chose him as his successor, forced ordination upon him, and when the former died (c. 418) Germanus accepted the position. He put away his wife and adopted a life of rigorous asceticism. In 429 he visited Britain and successfully opposed Pelagianism there. Prosper of Aquitaine says (*Chronicon*, *annus* 429) he was sent by Pope Celestine I. The life by Constantius says he was sent by a Gallican synod with Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and that seventeen or eighteen years later he went again with Severus, bishop of Treves. The later accounts

contain much that is clearly legendary and are decked out with miracles, including the story of a bloodless victory over the Picts and Saxons gained by the British under the lead of Germanus and Lupus by shouting "hallelujah"—the so-called "hallelujah victory." At the time of his death Germanus had gone to Ravenna to intercede at the imperial court for the Armoricans, who had revolted. Churches are dedicated to him and his name is preserved in legend in Wales and Cornwall.

Bibliography: The *Vita* attributed to Constantius (used by Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, i. 17–21), and done into meter with other material by the monk Heiricus or Hericus of Auxerre (d. 876), is with legends, *miracula*, and comment in *ASB*, July, vii. 184–287, and the metrical version is in *MPL*, cxxiv. 1131–1272. On the *Vita* consult L. M. Duru, *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne*, i. 48–89, Auxerre, 1850; C. Narbey, *Étude critique sur la vie de S. Germain d'Auxerre*, Paris, 1884. Duru, ut sup., i. 90–99, ii. 110–114, 183–189, 247–248, contains bibliographical material. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 16–21, give excerpts from early sources. Consult: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xv. 1–30; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ii. 256–261, Paris, 1735; W. Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 17–23, Oxford, 1897; *DNB*, xxi. 236–238; *DCB*, ii. 657–658.

GERMANUS, SAINT, OF PARIS: Bishop of Paris; b. in the district of Autun (230 m. s.e. of Paris) about 496; d. at Paris May 28, 576. He was of good family, and became head of the abbey of St. Symphorien at Autun about 540; about ten years later he became bishop of Paris, and as such took part in synods at Tours in 567 and Paris in 556 and 573 (*MGH, Leg., sectio* iii., *Concilia*, i., 1893, pp. 135, 145, 148). He did not shrink from excommunicating King Charibert I. for an amour with two sisters, winning by such faithfulness and courage the respect of the nobles, though his efforts to keep peace among them were of little avail. The people admired his rigidly ascetic life and his benevolence, and ascribed to him the gift of prophecy and miracles. He was buried in the Church of St. Vincent built by Childebert I. and consecrated by himself in 559; later it was named after Germanus and is now St. Germain des Près. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Sources: a letter to Queen Brunhilde is in *MPL*, lxxii. 77 and in *MGH, Epist.*, iii (1891), pp. 122–124; and matter relating to him is in *MGH, Dipl.*, i (1872), 5, no. 3. The *Vita* by his contemporary Fortunatus Venantius is in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, iv. 2 (1885), 11–27, and, with commentary, *epitaphium, miracula*, and *translatio*, in *ASB*, May, vi. 774–805. Consult: *Hist. littéraire de la France*, iii. 310, iv. 44, Paris, 1735–38; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 356–357, Leipsic, 1880; O. Holder-Egger, in *NA*, xviii (1893), 274–281.

GERMANY.

I. General Survey.
The Modern German Empire (§ 1).
The Protestant Church (§ 2).
The Roman Catholic Church (§ 3).
Education (§ 4).
II. Sectarianism in Germany.
Meaning of "Sect" (§1).
Different Classes of Non-established Churches (§ 2).
Attitude of the State toward Sects (§ 3).
Means of Combating Sects (§ 4).
Statistics (§ 5).

I. General Survey: Germany in the broadest sense is the country of an important branch of the Teutonic race, which first appears in history divided into numerous tribes occupying, roughly, the lands between the Rhine, the Danube, the Vistula, and the sea. The Romans included all the tribes in the general designation *Germani* and called their country *Germania*. Since about the twelfth century the Germans have called themselves *die Deutschen*. In the time of the migrations, and later, German peoples have become incorporated in neighboring and more distant lands, and their territories have been invaded and permanently occupied by aliens; nevertheless the bounds of Germany as a political designation have never materially changed. The conversion of the more important German tribes to Christianity is treated in separate articles (see Alemanni, Bavarians, etc., and notices of missionaries like Boniface). For the religious history of the older German Empire (more correctly the German-Roman or Holy Roman Empire) also, see articles like Charlemagne and other biographical sketches of important personages, names of places, events, periods, sects, and the like (Aachen; Augsburg, Religious Peace of; Anabaptists; etc.).

1. The Modern German Empire.

The modern German Empire, constituted in 1871, has an area of 208,830 square miles and a population (1908) of 60,641,278. It occupies a large part of Central Europe, consisting of twenty-five sovereign states and the "imperial territory" of Alsace-Lorraine. The king of Prussia is hereditary head of the federation, bearing the title German Emperor (not Emperor of Germany). It has colonial possessions aggregating 1,028,000 square miles in area, with a population of about 13,000,000 (12,500 Europeans), in Africa and Oceanica besides Kiau-Chau in China, which was ceded to Germany in 1898 on a lease for ninety-nine years (see Africa, II.; Pacific Islands). According to the latest figures accessible (those of *Kirchliches Jahrbuch*, 1908) the people of the empire are divided religiously as follows:

Protestants	37,646,852
Roman Catholics	22,094,492
Russian Orthodox	1,991
Greek Catholics	13,161
Dissenters (Baptists, Methodists, etc.; see below, II.)	259,717
Jews	607,862
Non-Christian religions (Mohammedans, Buddhists, etc.)	909
Other confessions (Pantheists, freethinkers, etc.)	12,024
Confessors of no religion	4,270
	60,641,278

The Protestants thus embrace about two-thirds of the population (62.5 per cent, not counting the dissenters) and the Roman Catholics a little more than one-third (36.1 per cent). This is substantially the proportion that existed at the close of the Thirty Years' War in 1648, and the geographical distribution of Protestants and Roman Catholics is still nearly the same as it was two centuries ago. The Roman Church predominates in the South, the Protestant in the North. Roman Catholics form 60.6 per cent of the people in Baden, 70.7 per cent in Bavaria, 72.2 per cent in Alsace-Lorraine. In Saxony, on the other hand, 94.5 per cent are Protestant, in Sleswick-Holstein 97.2 per cent, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin 98.3 per cent. Other North-German states show a similarly high proportion of

Protestants. The Jews constitute about 1 per cent of the population.

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the Protestant Church of Germany is that it is not divided into numerous rival denominations. This church has been liberal and found room in its fold for men of divergent views. The distinction between Lutherans and Reformed has existed since the Reformation; and attempts to unite the two confessions by acts of government (as in Prussia in 1817; see PRUSSIA) have produced the "United Evangelical Church" and bodies of "Separated Lutherans" who objected to the Union (see LUTHERANS, II.). But Lutherans, Reformed, and the Separatists are all reckoned to the "Evangelical Church" (for "Sectarianism in Germany" and the connotation of the word "sect," see below, II.). Liberty of conscience is secured by the several state constitutions and by imperial law. The Evangelical Church does not concern the empire as such, but is the affair of the individual states, each of which has its own church or churches which it supports. For organization, church government, and more detailed information, see the articles on the individual states; see also the denominational articles, particularly LUTHERANS. Information concerning Christian work and the religious life in Germany will be found in the articles on special organized agencies, such as BUND, EVANGELISCHER; CONFERENCE, FREE ECCLESIASTICAL-SOCIAL; DEACON; DEACONESS; EISENACH CONFERENCE; GUSTAV-ADOLF-VEREIN; INNERE MISSION; etc., and certain peculiarly German problems in church government and the relation between Church and State are discussed from the German standpoint in CHURCH AND STATE; CHURCH GOVERNMENT; COLLEGIALISM; and TERRITORIALISM.

2. The Protestant Church.

In 1900 the Evangelical Church in Germany had 17,454 clerical charges, 14,213 parishes, 10,037 stations, and 1,014 dioceses. Candidates for the ministry must complete a prescribed course of theological study at a university and pass certain examinations. The average yearly salary for a clergyman at the start is 2,260 marks; the average maximum salary is 3,564 marks. Hamburg pays the highest salaries, that of a beginner being 4,000 marks, the maximum 6,000 marks. Pensions vary from about 1,000 to 4,000 marks, according to length of service. Pensions for widows amount to 20 to 25 per cent of the highest salary drawn by the husband, and usually an extra allowance is made for the children.

The Roman Catholic Church in Germany is organized into five archbishoprics and twenty bishoprics, as follows: the archbishopric of Cologne, with bishoprics of Münster, Paderborn, and Treves; the archbishopric of Gnesen-Posen, with the bishopric of Culm; the archbishopric of Munich-Freising, with bishoprics of Augsburg, Passau, and Regensburg; the archbishopric of Bamberg, with bishoprics of Eichstätt, Würzburg, and Speyer; the archbishopric of Freiburg, with bishoprics of Fulda, Limburg, Mainz, and Rottenburg; and the six exempt bishoprics of Breslau, Ermland, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, Strasburg, and Metz. There are three apostolic vicariates, one for Saxony, one for Anhalt, and one for the northern missions; also two apostolic prefectures, one for Slcswick-Holstein and one for Lusatia. The Roman Church is subsidized by the various states just as is the Evangelical Church, and, in some cases, the Jewish Church. The Old Catholics have a bishop at Bonn.

3. The Roman Catholic Church.

In 1872 began in Germany the so-called *Kulturkampf*, during the course of which numerous stringent laws were passed against the Roman Catholics (see ULTRAMONTANISM). These measures, with the exception of the law expelling the Jesuits, were later repealed; and in 1904, through their powerful political party, the Centrum, the Catholics secured the repeal of the clause of this law giving full power to expel individual members of the Society of Jesus and kindred orders. Other clauses of the law excluding from the empire such orders in their corporate capacity remain in force. This is practically the only restriction now placed on the Roman Catholics in Germany. See GERMAN CATHOLICISM.

Education is compulsory throughout the empire for children from about the sixth to the fourteenth year, though the school-age varies somewhat in the different states. The percentage of illiteracy is only about one-half of one per cent. Despite increasing agitation for secular education, public elementary schools are usually confessional, being either Protestant or Roman Catholic; and local supervision of schools is still largely in the hands of the clergy (see CHURCH AND SCHOOL). In the curriculum religion has its place with other subjects. The system of secondary and technical education is admirable, and there are twenty-one universities in the empire, each having, as a rule, distinct faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. The theological faculties are Roman Catholic in the universities of Freiburg, Münster, and Würzburg. At Bonn, Breslau, Strasburg, and Tübingen there are both Evangelical and Roman Catholic theological faculties. All the universities are maintained and administered by the states in which they are located.]

4. Education.

II. Sectarianism in Germany: The word "sect" is derived from the Latin *sequor*, "to follow," or from *seco* in the sense of *sequor*. In classical Latin *secta* meant a mode of thinking, acting, or living, then specifically a political party or philosophical school or tendency. The Vulgate used the word to translate the Greek *hairesis* in Acts xxiv. 5, xxvi. 5, and in other passages where it means simply the religious tendency which one has chosen. In the Epistles of the New Testament the term has reference to the formation of factions within the Christian congregation (cf. Gal. v. 20; II Pet. ii. 1). This usage was continued by the Church, and Luther employed *Sekte* in his translation of the Bible in the same sense. Under present conditions in Germany, distinction must be made between the political and the church use of language. The State regards as sects all religious communities that are not acknowledged by it. But it is conceivable that the relation of the State to the Evangelical state

1. Meaning of "Sect."

churches might be dissolved, or that the State might annul the distinction between the acknowledged churches and the sects, and yet there might be communities which would have to be considered sects from the standpoint of the Church. The Evangelical Church of Germany claims privileges against the sects not so much by reason of its acknowledgment by the State as by being the national Church which for centuries has fostered and developed the religious and ethical ideals of the people. A church community might perhaps be designated most aptly by the name of sect where the exclusive or Donatistic conception of the Church forms the leading idea; where the demand to represent the communion of saints puts into the background the catholicity of the Church; where the national Church is considered more or less as a Babel from which one must separate himself; and where the historical development of the Church is treated with little consideration.

The communities which exist in Germany beside the Evangelical state churches or have existed there temporarily fall into very different groups. First must be mentioned those which were received into Germany because of persecution in other countries and subsequently were allowed to establish their own forms of worship. To this category belong, among others, the Walloons and French from the territory of Calvinism, the Bohemian Brethren, the Waldenses, and especially the Mennonites. Communities of this kind have been gradually brought into friendly relations with the state churches. From the standpoint of church feeling and sentiment even the Mennonites, who remained isolated, can hardly be considered sects, because their communities are not separations from the German Evangelical Churches and they have never attempted to proselyte from those Churches. In like manner the congregations of foreigners, such as English and Americans in Berlin and other cities, can not be considered sects.

2. Different Classes of Non-established Churches.

Separations from a state church constitute a second group. Such separations have originated because a minority did not approve of changes in the constitution and rites of a particular State Church (e.g., the Old Lutherans or Separated Lutherans in Prussia; see LUTHERANS; PRUSSIA). Such separations concern an entire church body. But there are also separations of a local and ephemeral character, as when a clergyman falls into conflict with his church authorities and carries a part of his congregation with him in the organization of a new church. It is a disputable question in how far such separations come under the conception of "sect." It is to be considered whether the separatists were justified in their opposition, which may have been against progress in the Church; whether their conception of the Church has experienced a change in the direction of Donatism; whether after separation they are still able to take part in the spiritual development of Evangelical theology or isolate themselves theologically and thus become sectarian.

A third group of separate congregations, which are undoubtedly "sects," has originated in Germany by the invasion of Anglo-American Christianity. Here we have to do not with separations based on the internal history of the churches of the German Reformation, but with representatives of another conception of churchdom, of other views concerning the way of salvation, and other ideals of piety. They have come over to Germany considering the German churches as a missionary field. Herein lies the real danger of sectarianism for the German churches—a danger of a twofold kind, because, in the first place, the German churches are deprived of zealous and active members; in the second place, the invasion of foreign ideas produces a foreign spirit in the national churches and exercises a disintegrating effect upon them.

The reasons for the estrangement of Germans from their mother church must not be sought primarily in sectarian teachings themselves. The attraction of sectarianism lies deeper. There is a wide variance between the religious ideal of the church and the actual condition of the congregations. The sect allures above all the active, working members by proposing to them a community of none but living Christians. Herein, in the compact spiritual community which it offers, lies the chief power of attraction exercised by a sect. Other reasons for separation are the craze for religious fads; spiritual haughtiness, which feels itself elevated above the duly appointed authorities; ambition; impatience and dislike of the dependence of the Church upon the State or of the "scientific theology" taught to the clergy by the universities.

The constitutional law of the State in regard to sects has undergone various changes since the Religious Peace of Augsburg and the Peace of Westphalia. By the former only Roman Catholics and adherents of the Augsburg Confession received recognition by the State; in 1648 the Reformed were also recognized. These three churches still enjoy special privileges. The State supports them, considers their spiritual offices as public offices, and provides theological faculties for the education of their clergy. Of other communities only the Jews were to be tolerated, but exceptions have been made. The Bohemian Brethren were received in Brandenburg, Prussia, in 1548, and the Mennonites in 1722. The French Reformed were granted privileges in 1639, 1685, and 1694. Frederick II. tolerated Moravians, Schwenkfelders, and even Socinians. In 1847 a law was passed empowering local courts to attest births, marriages, and deaths of "tolerated" communities that previously had been required to report them to the preachers of the parishes in which they lived for entry in the parish registers. A constitutional document of 1848 (revised 1850) made the enjoyment of civil and political rights independent of religious confession, but with the proviso that religious communities without corporative rights could obtain them only by special laws. Such rights were obtained by the Mennonites in 1874, and by the Baptists in 1875. The legal status of sects has been further alleviated by the introduction of civil register-offices and obligatory civil marriage (1874 for Prussia, 1875 for the empire).

3. Attitude of the State Toward Sects.

The church authorities agree that, in combating sects, appeals to the secular powers are to be rejected. An effective opposition must recognize that the religious needs which attract members of the state churches to the sects must be satisfied within the Church. Every appearance of a sect is a warning to the Church of defects and abuses, and to remove such faults is the way to preserve members for the Church, and meet the accusations of sectarians. It is an open question what measures of discipline should be followed against members who have associated themselves with sects without severing their connection with the State Church. It is maintained by some that occasional participation in the services of sectarians or even in their celebration of the Lord's Supper does not exclude a person from the State Church. Others would refuse the sacrament of the State Church to apostatizing members. There seems to be agreement on the following points: (1) clergymen of the state churches can not remain in office if they stand in any connection with a sect; (2) school authorities must tolerate no teacher of religion who has joined a sect; (3) adherents of a sect must not be admitted to honorary positions in the Church, such as that of elder and the like; (4) the receiving of a second baptism is to be treated as an actual separation from the State Church.

4. Means of Combating Sects.

Accurate statistics of sects in Germany are not available. According to Pieper's *Kirchliche Statistik Deutschlands* (Tübingen, 1899), which is based on the census of 1895, Prussia has besides 20,351,448 members of the Evangelical State Church, 119,245 members of "other Protestant church communities," i.e., almost 6 per cent of Evangelicals who do not belong to the State Church. According to the statistics of Prussia in 1900 there were 45,594 Old Lutherans, 14,543 Old Reformed, 4,031 Moravians, 13,876 Mennonites, 38,143 Baptists, 5,226 Methodists and Quakers, 32,215 Irvingites, 2,557 belonging to English churches, 272 members of the Salvation Army, 8,400 belonging to "Free Congregations," 27,679 "dissidents," and 5,635 "other Christians." The statistics of the German Empire for 1890 showed besides 31,000,000 of Protestants belonging to the State Churches, 145,000 adherents of smaller communities. Such figures are inaccurate, since many adherents of sects have not formally separated from their respective State Churches, and many who simply call themselves "Evangelical" are not counted. Later statistics show that the number of sectarians is increasing. (G. KAWERAU.)

5. Statistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For sources there is nothing comparable to the *MGH*. Consult also P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1864–73; J. von Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniæ*, Cologne, 1759–63; and for a general history the work of J. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, 8 vols., Freiburg, 1903, Eng. transl., 10 vols., London, 1907. A satisfactory review is given in E. F. Henderson, *Short Hist. of Germany*, 2 vols., New York, 1902. On the early religion consult P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Religion of the Teutons*, Boston, 1902; and for origins compare F. B. Gummere, *Germanic Origins*, New York, 1892. The early period of church history is treated in the works on the history of the Church in Germany by Friedberg, Rettberg, and Hauck, and in W. Stubbs, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, 476–1250*, ed. A. Hassall, 1908. For German Protestantism consult: C. F. A. Kahnis, *Internal Hist. of German Protestantism*, Edinburgh, 1856; J. I. Good, *Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany*, Reading, Pa., 1887; S. B. Gould, *The Church in Germany*, London, 1891; R. Rocholl, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, Leipsic, 1897; C. Tischhauser, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Basel, 1900; G. Ecke, *Die evangelischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhunderte*, Berlin, 1903; R. Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhunderte*, Leipsic, 1903; E. Foerster, *Die Entstehung der preussischen Landeskirche unter . Fricdrich Wilhelm III.*, vol. ii., Tübingen, 1907. For the Catholic Church consult: H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhunderte in Deutschland*, 4 vols., Mainz, 1887–1901; G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse. Le Catholicisme, 1800–1848*, 2 vols., Paris, 1897–1905; A. Werminghoff, *Geschichte der Kirchenfassung Deutschlands im Mittelalter*, Hanover, 1905. For the relations between Protestants and Catholics read: J. A. Moehler, *Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgegensätze zwischen den Katholiken und den Protestanten*, Regensburg, 1900; P. Majunke, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes in Deutschland*, Paderborn, 1902. For a general view of religious life consult: E. F. Williams, *Christian Life in Germany as Seen in the State and the Church*, New York, 1897. For statistics consult: P. Pieper, *Kirchliche Statistik Deutschlands*, Tübingen, 1899; H. A. Krose, *Konfessionsstatistik Deutschlands*, Freiburg, 1904; Von Hirschfeld, in *Zeitschrift des königlichen preussischen statistischen Bureaus*, iii (1863), iv (1864); J. Schneider, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (an annual; 35th issue, 1908). On sectarianism in Germany consult: *Allgemeine Kirchenblatt*, 1853, 1855, 1884, 1885 (gives reports of discussions in the Eisenach Conference on the question of sects); H. Schmidt, *Die Kirche. Ihre biblische Idee und die Formen ihrer . Erscheinung*, pp. 189 sqq., Leipsic, 1884; H. F. Jacobson, in *ZKR*, i (1861), 392 sqq.; idem, *Evangelisches Kirchenrecht*, i. 124–125, Halle, 1864; C. Palmer, *Die Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs*, Tübingen, 1877; L. von Rönne, *Staatsrecht der preussischen Monarchie*, ii. 2, pp. 151 sqq., Leipsic, 1882; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 318 sqq.; E. Dresbach, *Die protestantischen Sekten der Gegenwart*, Düsseldorf, 1887; W. Rohnert, *Kirche, Kirchen und Sekten*, Leipsic, 1900; E. Kalb, *Kirchen und Sekten der Gegenwart*, Stuttgart, 1905; J. Jüngst, *Der Methodismus in Deutschland*, Giessen, 1906.

GERNLER, gārn'ler, **LUKAS**: Swiss Reformer; b. at Basel Aug. 19, 1625; d. there Feb. 9, 1675. After completing his theological studies at the age of twenty, he visited Geneva, and then made a tour of France, England, Holland, and Germany. On his return to Basel in 1649, he was appointed deacon in general for all the churches of the city, and in 1653 was made archdeacon (assistant pastor) at the cathedral, becoming president and first pastor three years later. At the same time he was appointed professor of polemics and the encyclopedia of theology, a position which he exchanged for a professorship of the Old Testament in 1665. His opposition to the overtures of John Durie (q.v.) for union resulted in their rejection in 1662 and 1666, and his hostility toward the theology of Saumur was equally marked. He was the chief author of the *Syllabus controversiarum*, which appeared at Basel in 1662, and prepared the way for the Helvetic Consensus Formula. His theological writings are of minor importance, though several collections of his sermons have been published. He induced the council to erect an orphan asylum in Basel, and in 1666 edited the *Agenda* in a form which remained unchanged for the Church of Basel until 1826. Under the title of *Antiquitates Gernlerianæ* he published a collection of documents which are one of

the chief sources for a knowledge of the Reformation in Basel. (R. STÄHELIN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Athenæ Rauricæ*, pp. 48–50, Basel, 1778; K. R. Hagenbach, *Geschichte . . der ersten Basler Confession*, pp. 167 sqq., Basel, 1827; idem, *Die theologische Schule Basels und ihre Lehrer*, iv. 31–32, ib. 1860; *ADB*, ix. 37.

GEROK, gê-rōk', **KARL**: German preacher and poet; b. at Vaihingen-on-the-Enz (15 m. n.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Jan. 30, 1815; d. at Stuttgart Jan. 14, 1890. His father removed to Stuttgart a few weeks after the birth of his son, and there Karl Gerok spent most of his life. As his father and both grandfathers were clergymen, the ministry was his natural vocation. He was educated at the gymnasium of Stuttgart and in 1832 entered the University of Tübingen, where he studied diligently Hegel's philosophy and Schleiermacher's theology. In 1837 he became his father's vicar in Stuttgart. From 1840 till 1843 he was tutor in Tübingen. In 1844 he became deacon in Böblingen (about 9 miles from Stuttgart), where he had leisure to write numerous treatises and essays for periodicals. In 1849 he became deacon in the Spitalkirche of Stuttgart, in 1851 in the Stiftskirche. In 1852 he was appointed archdeacon in the same church and dean of the country diocese. In 1862 he became preacher of the Spitalkirche and dean of the town diocese. From 1868 until his death he was court preacher and member of the consistory with the title and rank of prelate. Apart from his activity as pastor and preacher, he held offices as president or member in numerous committees and societies.

Gerok was a man in whom the culture of his time and Christian truth stood in living connection. To the harmony of his nature corresponded the mildness of his judgment in regard to others; even in the fall he was able to discover the weak germs of goodness. His sermons were built upon the moral basis of diligence and faithfulness. Although he carefully elaborated and memorized them, they were plain and simple, yet full of life and color. They had always a practical relation to life, and their form and contents were aided by a solemn and edifying delivery that inspired esteem for Christianity even in worldly people. As a poet, Gerok educated his taste by studying the great classics. He kept his productions secret until his mature age, and it was only in his fortieth year that his first poem was published. His poetry had its root in the word of the Bible, and all subjects which he treated—history, the fatherland, and nature—are transfigured by the light of a Christian view of the world. He was essentially a lyric poet. His collections of poems appeared under the titles *Palmblätter* (Stuttgart, 1857; Eng. transl., *Palm Leaves*, London, 1885); *Pfingstrosen* (Gütersloh, 1864); *Blumen und Sterne* (Stuttgart, 1868); *Deutsche Ostern* (1871); *Auf einsamen Gängen* (1878); *Der letzte Strauss* (1884); *Unter dem Abendstern* (1886); *Christkind* (1887). He published also several volumes of sermons, and *Von Jerusalem nach Rom* (Stuttgart, 1868), Bible studies on the Acts of the Apostles. His "Homiletical Suggestions" to G. V. Lechler's Acts of the Apostles in Lange's Commentary (Bielefeld, 1861) may also be mentioned. (H. MOSAPP.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: In the first place as a source stands Gerok's *Jugenderinnerungen*, Leipsic, 1898. Consult: H. Mosapp, *Karl Gerok, ein Bild seines Lebens und Wirkens*, Stuttgart, 1890; idem, *Karl Gerok in seiner Wirksamkeit für den Gustav-Adolf-Verein*, Barmen, 1890; F. Braun, *Erinnerungen an Karl Gerok*, Leipsic, 1891; G. Gerok, *Karl Gerok, ein Lebensbild aus seinen Briefen und Aufzeichnungen*, Stuttgart, 1892.

GERRHENIANS, ger-rî'ni-ənz: The name of a people or of the inhabitants of a district in the extreme south of Palestine, mentioned II Macc. xiii. 24 as marking the southern boundary (on the coast) of the Syrian province. The description there given tallies with the passage I Macc. xi. 59. Identification is not to be made with the military and impost station named Gerrhon or Gerrha, fifty stadia east of Pelusium, since this place was in Egyptian territory, and the passage in Maccabees does not imply a military station. Stark and Ewald connect it with the Gerar of Gen. xx. 1, xxvi. 1; II Chron. xiv. 13. The *regio Geraritica* is well known from the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and of Jerome (240, and 124) as located beyond (i.e., to the south of) Daroma as the borderland of Canaan and Egypt. The modern name of the Wadi Jerar or Jerur in the neighborhood of Kadesh recalls the old name and agrees with the geographical conditions.

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. B. Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*, p. 463, Jena, 1852; H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv. 416, Göttingen, 1864; C. L. W. Grimm, *Das zweite . Buch der Makkabäer*, Leipsic, 1857; H. Wace, *Apocrypha*, ii. 633, London, 1888.

GERSON, zhār''sōn', JEAN CHARLIER DE.

His Philosophy. Mysticism (§ 1).
His Pride as a Theologian. Influence of Patriotic Feeling (§ 2).
Gerson's Doctrine of the Papacy and Councils (§ 3).
The Council of Constance (§ 4).
Last Years (§ 5).

Johannes Arnaudi de Gersonio, as the earliest entry of his name reads in the records of the University of Paris, was chancellor of the University of Paris, one of the most prominent figures in the ecclesiastical disputes of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and one of the founders of Gallicanism (q.v.). He was born in the long since obliterated hamlet of Gerson (Jarson), not far from Rethel (100 m. n.e. of Paris), in the diocese of Reims, Dec. 14, 1363, and died at Lyons July 12, 1429. He was the eldest son of peasants, Arnolphe le Charlier and Elisabeth Chardenière (concerning an extant letter from his mother to her two eldest sons, cf. Schwab, p. 54; Jadart, pp. 119–120), and his education was made possible by the Duke of Burgundy's patronage. After preparation at Reims, he went to Paris in 1377 and entered the College of Navarre. Having completed his course in the arts in 1381, he took up theology the same year. In 1383 and 1384 he was procurator of the Gallic nation; in 1387 he was a member of the university's embassy to Clement VII. against the Dominican Jean de Montson, who denied the Immaculate Conception. He became doctor of theology in 1392, and in 1395 succeeded his teacher Pierre d'Ailly in the chancellorship. This office, which he occupied to the end of his life, gave him opportunity to exert a lasting influence not only

upon theological instruction, but on academic instruction at large; while the ecclesiastical position therewith connected favored his natural inclination to activity in the domain of ecclesiastical practise, preaching, and the cure of souls.

He began his scholastic activity with a notable reform of the theological course on its practical side (cf. the letter to his teacher D'Ailly, *De reformatione theologiæ*, *Opera*, i. 1, p. 120; and two letters to the scholars of the College of Navarre, p. 106). Only from the closing period of his life are certain tracts preserved which treat of logical and metaphysical problems. Gerson is a nominalist, but he seeks to mediate between this tendency and realism; our ideas of things first have necessity in the notion of God, and at this point being and thinking coincide. Philosophy, too, is a revelation of God, but knowledge needs to be supplemented through faith, which is not merely an act of cognition, but rather a matter of volition. Accordingly the task of theology is a practical one; and for Gerson the true theology is mysticism. The function of scholasticism is merely to supply the form for the treatment of mysticism. But the latter, in turn, can preserve its wholesomeness, that is to say, its ecclesiastical character, only by such treatment. Radical mysticism, including that of Jan van Ruysbroeck (q.v.), Gerson combated zealously. His prototypes were Hugo and Richard of St. Victor (qq.v.) and Bonaventura; on occasion he reaches back to Bernard, Augustine, and the great Dionysius. His principal mystical writings (*Opera*, vol. iii., ed. Du Pin) belong in a remarkable degree to the period of his activity in church politics; the *Considerationes de theologia mystica* grew out of lectures, and their second part bears evidence of having been written down in the autumn of 1407, during a journey as ambassador to Genoa. The mystical process culminates in love, the fundamental attitude of mind, innate in man. In its highest development—to be sure not an "actual" union with God, but still the closest conceivable moral union—it is also the highest knowledge. But the prepossessions of the theologian here prevent Gerson from drawing the right conclusion from this knowledge. He speaks of a perfected knowledge without love, and of a love without perfected insight. Only the theologian can attain to perfected mysticism. And to restore to the theologian his natural right, to enable him to exercise this right, was the aim of his many-sided literary and practical activity.

1. His Philosophy. Mysticism.

The overpowering development of the papal rule in the Church had thrust law before theology, the faculty of the canonists before that of the theologians. And now the schism threatened to destroy utterly the venerable halo of the Parisian doctors of divinity; with a distinctly French papacy, also —after they had prided themselves on having pronounced decisions for the popes of the entire Church—they saw the danger that they would sink to the level of theological schools like Avignon and Toulouse. With their ambition patriotism worked as an equally powerful factor, a product of the times, of the political need of France as it then was—the most glowing enthusiasm for the idea of the French kingdom; and yet, the national growth of that same kingdom was, in reality, to strike the death-blow to the university's world-fame. The union of heterogeneous elements the theologian seeks in a single dogma: France the New Jerusalem, and its kingdom, since the baptism of Clovis, consecrated by a universal ecclesiastical call! The coalescence of the two factors is what stamps the character of a man like Gerson in its comprehensive historical bearings; for that is what dominates the activity in church politics which placed him among the leaders of his age.

2. His Pride as a Theologian. Influence of Patriotic Feeling.

Gerson entered the field of church politics as a follower of his teacher D'Ailly; and this occasioned him at the outset a serious conflict, since he was pledged to follow the House of Burgundy, whereas D'Ailly had attached himself to the young Prince of Orléans, and from the pontificate of Benedict XIII., the political opposition of these two houses had appeared more and more sharply in ecclesiastical matters. Gerson sought to mediate, especially in his highly finished *Trialogus in materia schismatis*. Nevertheless he belonged to the Burgundian camp, and in a great state address, in 1405, he dared to lay down the law to the "tyrant" Orléans. In the subsequent evolution of affairs, he became more and more of a partizan down to the Council of Pisa. He did not attend the same in person, but in his *De unitate ecclesiastica* and *De auferibilitate papæ ab ecclesia* he upheld its legitimacy in the strongest terms; after the decrees of the council itself, his tracts are the most important original sources for "Conciliism." Here, too, Gerson is not original, but dependent in the main on Conrad of Gelnhausen and Henry of Langenstein (q.v.); it was his casuistical elaboration of their principles, and, on another side, his diverting them from the danger of an antihierarchical negation, that first made them popular. For Gerson is so little of a "liberal" that he attaches preeminent validity to papacy and hierarchy, as the mode of being immutably ordained by God for the Church. However, he makes a distinction between the office in itself (*formaliter*) and the office in its personal administration at any given time (*materialiter*); and as every law is interpreted by the purpose of the law, so the hierarchy is subordinate to the more comprehensive idea of the Church Ecumenical. Furthermore, this is not a mere theory, but it has its visible illustration in the general and at least potentially infallible council. The council, to be sure, is composed only of hierarchical authorities, but still every believer must be able to find expression therein. The individual pope is subject to the council, and, if need be, it can assemble without him. Indeed, the motive thought so greatly outweighs, in Gerson's mind, the literal text of the law that he supposes the contingency that a duly elected pope might be executed, if the weal of the Church required it.

3. Gerson's Doctrine of the Papacy and Councils.

At Constance, Gerson experienced the gratification of seeing this doctrine of his erected into an

article of faith; and he played a leading part at the head of the deputation from the University of Paris in the critical days after the flight of John XXIII (see CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF). But from that time forth his fame rapidly paled. In the trial of Huss he served as accuser. After that, apart from certain reports and gala addresses, his name is no longer mentioned in the official documents. The animating forces of the council passed out of his control. In fact, though chancellor of the first university in the world, from whom an influence over that impressionable assembly might have been expected equaled by few others, he had missed his mark. He had conceived the notion of making the council decide a question which was really French in its coloring and became uplifted to the plane of a theological moral problem. On Nov. 23, 1407, an assassin's hand, in the hire of John of Burgundy, the son and heir of Philip, had made way with Duke Louis of Orléans, the brother of Charles VI.; and in the year following, Jean Petit, professor of theology in Paris, justified this murder as due to a tyrant and arch-traitor. Gerson was so deeply devoted to the Burgundian cause that he maintained silence, and still further upheld the assassin's policy. But in Paris this shortly led to mob rule, and revolution was succeeded by reaction. Patriots' eyes were opened, and they became permanently estranged from the Burgundian. Gerson in particular now believed all the nation's misery to be traceable to that crying violation of law and morality, and thenceforward he applied all his power to the end of making satisfaction, without which a real peace were impossible. But by this course he naturally passed into the service of the opposing party, which came to wield a decisive influence in shaping the policy of the French delegation to the council, and—if a few waverings be excepted—continued to maintain this influence throughout the entire session. The bishop of Paris, on Feb. 23, 1414, had been obliged to condemn the "doctrine" of Petit; and it was desired to have the council confirm this verdict. In striving for this goal Gerson displayed a persistency which proclaims a pure idealism far exalted above partizan passion. It is his fairest renown, but also the tragic strain in his life. For in the course of the highly excited proceedings which extended over the years 1415 to 1417, he almost entirely isolated himself. From the council, which he had approached so joyfully and hopefully, he withdrew under the bitterest protest (cf. the *Dialogus apologeticus* and *Tractatus quomodo etan liceat in causis fidei a summo pontifice appellare seu ejus judicium declinare*). And, instead of returning to his beloved fatherland, he had to wander into exile for fear of his former patron, the Duke of Burgundy.

4. The Council of Constance.

Through Albert of Bavaria he first found refuge at Rattenberg on the Inn, later at Neuburg. In the autumn of 1418 he moved over to Austrian territory, probably to Mölk; and Duke Frederick of Austria even offered him a Vienna professorship. After the assassination of John of Burgundy (Sept. 10, 1419) Gerson retired to the quiet of a canonry at St. Paul's in Lyons, employing his leisure in literary labors. Amid the abundance of partly edifying, partly dogmatic and moral writings that belong to this latter period, mention may be made merely of the *Consolatio theologiæ;* the rather long poem *Josephina,* in honor of St. Joseph; the Gospel harmony *Monotessaron;* the *Dialogus sophiæ et naturæ super cælibatu;* the treatise *De concordia metaphysicæ cum logica;* the *Collectorium super Magnificat,* and the *Tractatus super cantica canticorum.* He appeared in public only to deliver an address before a provincial synod at Lyons (1421). That he instructed children is probably a myth. He obtained a proud monument in the Church of St. Lawrence. The populace honored him as one of the blessed, and miracles at his grave were reported. But this memorial did not survive the progress of time, and the Church of St. Lawrence itself succumbed to the Revolution. Only his title of *Doctor christianissimus* continued to live in the learned world in connection with his perennially reprinted works. For his claim to the authorship of the "Imitation of Christ" see KEMPIS, THOMAS À.

5. Last Years.

B. BESS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best and most complete edition of the works of Gerson is by L. Ellies Du Pin, 5 vols., Antwerp, 1706. For discussion of the sources up to 1858 the best works are J. B. Schwab, *Johann Gerson,* Würzburg, 1858, and P. Tschackert, *Peter von Ailli,* Gotha, 1877. Consult J. C. E. Bourret, *Essai historique et critique sur les sermons français de Gerson,* Paris, 1858; H. Jadart, *Jean de Gerson, . recherches sur son origine, son village natal et sa famille,* Reims, 1882; K. Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters,* vol. iv., Vienna, 1887; E. Guillon, *De Johanne Gersonio,* Paris, 1888; B. Bess, *Johannes Gerson und die kirchen-politischen Parteien Frankreichs vor dem Koncil zu Pisa,* Marburg, 1891. Consult also R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics,* i. 338, 369, London, 1879; *KL,* v. 457–473; Neander, *Christian Church,* v. 53–93 et passim.

GERTH VAN WIJK, JOHANNES ABRAHAM: Dutch Protestant; b. at Wijk bij Duurstede (12 m. s.e. of Utrecht) Aug. 27, 1827; d. at The Hague Dec. 23, 1907. He was educated at the University of Utrecht (D.D. 1859), and was minister at Eemnesbuiten (1864-66), Kampen (1866-72), Groningen (1872-74), and The Hague (1874-1902), being made pastor emeritus in 1902. In the latter year he was also made a knight of the order of Orange-Nassau. He took an active part in the promotion of religious teaching in the public schools of Holland, and was a Dutch delegate to the conferences of the Evangelical Alliance at Copenhagen (1884), Berlin (1888), Florence (1891), and London (1896). Besides a number of translations and contributions to the Hauck-Herzog *RE,* he wrote *Historia Ecclesiæ Ultrajectinæ Romano-Catholicæ male Jansenisticæ dictæ* (Utrecht, 1859) and *Onze kinderen in Christus geheiligd* (1866).

GERTRUDE: The name of several women honored as saints or blessed in the Roman Catholic Church.

1. Saint Gertrude the Great was born at Eisleben (18 m. w.n.w. of Halle) Jan. 6, 1256, and died at the Benedictine nunnery of Helpede, or Helfta, near Eisleben, in 1302 (according to others, about 1311). She entered this convent at the age of five and received a thorough education from its second

abbess, St. Gertrude of Hackeborn (see below, 3). For twenty years her interest lay in secular subjects, until on Jan. 27, 1281, a vision of Christ changed the entire current of her thoughts, and she devoted herself henceforth to the exclusive study of the Bible and the Church Fathers. In Feb., 1290, she began to commit to writing the visions vouchsafed her. The German original of her four books of *Insinuationes divinæ pietatis* (or, more properly, *Legatus divinæ pietatis*) is lost, and the work is preserved only in a Latin translation, first edited by the Carthusian Johann von Lansperg (Cologne, 1536) and frequently reprinted, both in Latin and in French, Flemish, Spanish, and German versions, especially after her canonization in 1677. Her biography, prefixed to the *Insinuationes* as the first book, seems to have been written some time after her death by one of the younger nuns at Helpede.

2. Saint (or Blessed) Gertrude, Abbess of Nivelles, was born about 625, and died, probably, Mar. 17, 659 (scarcely, as some think, in 664). She was the daughter of Pippin of Landen and Itta, or Iduberga, and when the latter founded the convent of Nivialla (the modern Nivelles near Brussels), about the middle of the seventh century, Gertrude, who had already refused the hand of a king (possibly Dagobert), entered it and succeeded her mother as abbess in 652. Her symbol is the lily, the emblem of virginity, and she is also frequently represented as surrounded by hosts of mice, since the expulsion of these creatures from the fields is recorded as one of her miracles.

3. Gertrude of Hackeborn, the sister of Matilda (q.v.), was born near Halberstadt (28 m. s.w. of Magdeburg) 1232, and died at the convent of Helpede in 1292. In 1251 she became abbess of the convent of Rodersdorf, but in 1258 went to Helpede, where she spent the remainder of her life.

4. Gertrude, the half legendary sister of Charlemagne, is said to have founded the convent of Karlsburg (or Saalburg) on the Main.

5. Gertrude, the daughter of the Thuringian landgrave Ludwig VI. and Saint Elizabeth, was born about 1226 and died in 1297. She was abbess of the Premonstratensian convent of Altenburg-on-the-Lahn.

6. Gertrude of Oosten, a pious Beguin at Delft, Holland, is said to have received the stigmata in 1340; she died in 1358. (O. Zöcklerâ€ .)

Bibliography: 1. Weissbrodt, *Der heilige Gertrud der Grossen "Gesandter der göttlichen Liebe,"* 2 vols., Freiburg, 1876; M. Sintzel, *Gertrudis . . Leben und Offenbarungen*, 2 vols., Regensburg, 1876; *KL*, v. 473–476.

2. The *Vita*, by a contemporary, is with a commentary in *ASB*, March, ii. 590–600, and ed. B. Krusch, in *MGH*, *Script. rer. Merov.*, ii (1888), 447–464. Consult H. E. Bonnell, *Die Anfänge des karolingischen Hauses*, pp. 149–153, Berlin, 1866; J. Friedrich, *KD*, ii. 341, 667–670; Hauck, *KD*, i. 307; for further literature, Potthast, *Wegweiser*, 1339–40, and *KL*, v. 479–480.

3. *Revelationes Gertrudianæ ac Mechtildianæ*, vol. i., preface, Paris, 1875; *KL*, v. 477–479.

GERVASIUS AND PROTASIUS, SAINTS: Two brothers martyred at Milan during the reign of Nero. In 386 their remains were found by St. Ambrose under the pavement of the church at Milan. He describes his discovery in a letter to his sister (*Epist.*, xxii.; cf. also Augustine, *Conf.*, ix. 7), and says the place of burial was revealed to him in a vision. This vision and the miracles which the relics immediately performed were used by Ambrose in his contest with the Arians as proof of his orthodoxy. The cult of the martyrs rapidly spread over Europe and was introduced into Africa by Augustine. In 1864 a porphyry shrine was discovered at Milan, which, according to the inscription it bears, contains the remains of the two martyrs and of Ambrose.

Bibliography: *ASB*, June, iii. 817–846; L. A. Muratori, *Anecdota*, i. 171–177, Milan, 1697; *DCB*, ii. 666; *KL*, iv. 486–491.

GESENIUS, (HEINRICH FRIEDRICH) WILHELM: German Protestant Hebraist; b. at Nordhausen (38 m. n.n.w. of Erfurt) Feb. 3, 1786; d. at Halle Oct. 23, 1842. After completing his early training at the gymnasium of his native city, he entered the University of Helmstedt in 1803, where he received a lasting influence from the rationalistic H. Henke. Having taught for a short time at Helmstedt, he migrated to Göttingen at Easter, 1806, and a few months later received the degree of Ph.D. For three years he lectured at Göttingen on the Old Testament and on the classics, Neander being one of his first pupils. In 1809 he accepted a position in the Roman Catholic gymnasium of Heiligenstadt, but in the following year went to a more congenial position at Halle as extraordinary professor of theology. In 1811 he was promoted to ordinary professor, and retained this position until his death, declining calls to Göttingen in 1827 and to Oxford in 1832. Semester after semester he had in his courses of lectures over a thousand pupils. In 1820 he visited France and England, and in 1835 went to England and Holland, both times bringing back rich treasures for his studies. Shortly after his return from this second trip, he was seized with a stubborn and painful disease of the stomach, which recurred at irregular intervals with increasing severity until it finally caused his death.

Gesenius was the pioneer of a new era of Hebrew philology. On the basis of the great Dutch Orientalists of the eighteenth century, he divorced Hebrew linguistics from dogmatic theology, and placed the subject on the level of other linguistic sciences by a systematic comparison of cognate languages and a strictly rational method. As a lecturer he was no less influential than as an author. He was a born teacher, and knew how to make the driest subjects fascinating in their interest. Exactness of method, absorption in details, sobriety of judgment, clear presentation, and practicality were his chief characteristics. He was a student of linguistics rather than of theology, and his attention was devoted to details rather than to generalizations, even in the realm of Hebrew grammar.

In 1830, three years after receiving the title of consistorial councilor, Gesenius was attacked for his rationalism by the Pietistic *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, but the preliminary investigation conducted by the Minister of Worship, Altenstein, ended in the complete vindication of the accused professor and his colleagues. He was again assailed by

Heinrich Ewald for his grammatical views, but this onslaught in its turn proved futile.

The chief works of Gesenius were lexicographical. His dictionary, which bore in its first edition the title *Hebräisches Handwörterbuch über die Schriften des Alten Testaments mit Einschluss der geographischen Namen und der chaldäischen Wörter beym Daniel und Ezra*, was begun in 1810 and completed two years later. Like the majority of his works, it was published at Leipsic. In 1815 appeared an abridgment entitled *Neues Hebräisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch über die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, which after its third edition in 1828 was translated by the author into Latin as *Lexicon manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti libros* (1833). The abridgment gradually superseded the original work, and has been repeatedly reprinted since the death of Gesenius, the fifth to the seventh editions (1868) being edited by F. E. C. Dietrich, the eighth to the eleventh (1890) by F. Mühlau and W. Volck, and the twelfth to the fourteenth (1905) by F. Buhl, A. Socin, and H. Zimmern. The richest fruit of his lexicographical studies was his *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguæ Hebrææ et Chaldææ Veteris Testamenti* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1829–58), which was continued and completed after its author's death by his pupil E. Rödiger. Among his grammatical works the chief is his *Hebräische Grammatik*, which first appeared in 1813, and which passed through repeated editions, thirteen being issued in the lifetime of Gesenius, who revised the last in 1842. After his death the fourteenth to the twenty-first editions (1872) were revised by E. Rödiger, and the twenty-second to the twenty-seventh (1902) by E. Kautzsch. This is by far the most popular work of Gesenius, and has been translated into French, Danish, English, Polish, Hungarian, and other languages. His extremely rationalistic *Hebräisches Lesebuch* appeared in 1814, and after passing through six editions in the author's lifetime was edited by W. M. L. de Wette (1844) and A. Heiligstedt (1873). Mention may also be made of his *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift* (Leipsic, 1815) and *Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache mit Vergleichung der verwandten Dialekte* (1817).

The sole exegetical work of Gesenius was his *Der Prophet Jesaia* (3 parts, Leipsic, 1820–21), one of the last products of the rationalistic exegesis which had hitherto enjoyed complete supremacy, and one of the best productions of its class.

His remaining writings, in chronological order, include *Versuch über die maltesische Sprache* (Leipsic, 1810), in which he rightly interpreted the language as a corrupt Arabic dialect; *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole et auctoritate* (Halle, 1815); *De Samaritanorum theologia ex fontibus ineditis* (Leipsic, 1822); *Carmina Samaritana* (1824); *De Bar Alio et Bar Bahlulo, lexicographis Syro-Arabicis ineditis* (1834); *Paläographische Studien über phönizische und punische Schrift* (Leipsic, 1835); *Scripturæ linguæque Phœniciæ monumenta quotquot supersunt* (3 parts, 1837), the result of his second trip to England and a work which marks an epoch in Phenician studies; and numerous briefer contributions to periodicals, particularly to the *Allgemeine Litteraturzeitung*, of which he was associate editor after 1828. He likewise contributed a number of articles to Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklopädie*. (R. KRAETZSCHMAR†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Both the *Handwörterbuch* and the *Grammatik* of Gesenius have appeared in several English translations. The earliest version of the former was by J. W. Gibbs (Andover, 1824); other versions, many of them with amendments and additions, followed—by C. Leo (2 parts, Cambridge, 1825–28), E. Robinson (Boston, 1836), and S. P. Tregelles (London, 1846). The *Grammatik* was rendered into English by M. Stuart (Andover, 1826), T. J. Conant (Boston, 1839), B. Davies (London, 1869), and G. W. Collins and A. E. Cowley (Oxford, 1898). H. Gesenius, *W. Gesenius, Ein Erinnerungsblatt an den hundertjährigen Geburtstag*, Halle, 1886 (printed, not published); R. H. S. (Robert Haym?), *Gesenius. Eine Erinnerung für seine Freunde*, Berlin, 1842; T. K. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 53 sqq., London, 1893; *ADB*, ix. 89 sqq.

GESENIUS, ge-sî'ni-us *or* gê-zê'nî-us, **JUSTUS:** Lutheran theologian of the seventeenth century, known for his catechisms; b. at Esbeck (near Elze, 20 m. s. of Hanover), in the principality of Kalenberg, July 6, 1601; d. at Hanover Sept. 18, 1673. His father was preacher at Esbeck. Having received his early education at the Adreanum in Hildesheim, he went in his eighteenth year to Helmstedt, where he studied under Georg Calixtus and Conrad Hornejus. In 1628 he took his degree of master of philosophy in Jena and was called as pastor to the church of St. Magnus in Brunswick. After seven years of beneficent activity there, he received a call to Hildesheim, the seat of George, duke of Brunswick, as court chaplain and preacher in the cathedral. After the duke's death (1641), he, as well as the whole consistory, removed to Hanover, where he became chief court chaplain and general superintendent of the principality of Kalenberg; later (1665) he was general superintendent of Grubenhagen as well. He received the degree of doctor of divinity in 1643 for a dissertation, *De igne purgatorio*.

Gesenius' importance lies chiefly in the services he rendered in the production of good hymnals and catechisms. With his friend David Denicke, he brought out a hymnal containing 222 hymns (Hanover, 1646), which was later enlarged and arranged for use in the churches. The compilers did not confine themselves to collecting and arranging the hymns, but also adapted many of the older ones and probably added a few of their own composition. To correct the prevailing ignorance in regard to Christian doctrine, Gesenius, in 1631, brought out his *Kleine Katechismusschule*, or "Brief Instruction as to how the Catechism Should be Taught to the Young and the Simple" (often reprinted). Later, by order of Duke George and of the consistory, he issued an abridgment of this work under the title *Kleine Catechismusfragen über den kleinen Catechismum Lutheri* (1639 and many times republished). This work constitutes the celebrated catechism of Gesenius, which was introduced into all the schools of the principality of Kalenberg and gained great repute in many parts of Lower Saxony. Notwithstanding the praise which was accorded the author, he was violently

attacked, especially by Statius Buscher in his *Cryptopapismus novæ theologiæ Helmstadiensis* (Hamburg, 1638). Although Gesenius justified himself in a *Gründliche Widerlegung* (Lüneburg, 1641) and although his innocence was established through an investigation by impartial theologians, it must be admitted that, carried away by his zeal for a lively faith and for better knowledge, he allowed himself to wander from the straight path of Lutheran doctrine. Of the charge that he was secretly a Roman Catholic he clears himself in his last important work, *Warum willst du nicht römisch-katholisch werden, wie deine Vorfahren waren?* (4 parts, Hanover, 1669–72). The strife concerning his *Catechismusfragen* was renewed in the eighteenth century, when King George I., in 1723, sought vainly to introduce Gesenius's catechism into the duchies of Bremen and Verden (cf. *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, 1724). In addition to the other services rendered by Gesenius to the cause of religious education, he published, in 1656, a manual of instruction in Biblical history, *Biblische Historien Alten und Neuen Testaments*. CARL BERTHEAU.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. J. Rehtmeier, *Braunschweigische Kirchengeschichte*, iv. 458 sqq., Brunswick, 1715; J. K. F. Schlegel, *Kirchen- und Reformations-Geschichte von Norddeutschland*, vols. ii.–iii., passim, Hanover, 1829–32; F. Ehrenfeuchter, *Zur Geschichte des Katechismus*, pp. 79–82 and supplement pp. 62–67, Göttingen, 1857; E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, iii. 230–237, Stuttgart, 1867; C. A. G. von Zezschwitz, *System der Katechetik*, II., ii. 1, pp. 93 sqq., Leipsic, 1874; *ADB*, ix. 87 sqq.; W. Bode, *Quellennachweis über die Lieder des hannoverischen Gesangbuches*, Hanover, 1881; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 419.

GESHURITES, ge-shū'raits. See CANAAN, § 11.

GESS, ges, **WOLFGANG FRIEDRICH**: German Lutheran, belonging to the modern kenotic school (see CHRISTOLOGY, X., 4, § 2; KENOSIS); b. at Kirchheim unter Teck (16 m. s.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, June 27, 1819; d. at Wernigerode (43 m. s.w. of Magdeburg) June 1, 1891. He studied at the monastic school at Blaubeuren and at Tübingen (1837–41), and became vicar of his father, who was general superintendent at Heilbronn. Following the Württemberg custom of his time, as candidate in theology in 1843 he visited various universities—Heidelberg, Bonn, Berlin, Wittenberg, and Halle. His first pastorate was at Maulbronn, whence he returned in 1846 to Tübingen as repetent, and then became pastor at Grossanspach. In 1850 he went to the Mission House in Basel as instructor in theology. From 1864 to 1871 he was ordinary professor of systematic theology and exegesis at Göttingen, from 1871 to 1880 professor at Breslau and member of the Silesian consistory, then general superintendent of the province of Posen till 1885, after which time he lived in retirement at Wernigerode.

The teaching of Gess was fundamentally Biblical. "The Biblical doctrine of faith, which we have here to deal with," he declared in one of his lectures at Basel, "is derived not from the symbolical documents of any particular Church, but immediately from the revealing sources themselves. It presupposes that the transmitting author really comprehends the fundamental thoughts [of the Spirit] out of which all Scripture has grown and did not import extraneous or foreign views." With Auberlen, Riggenbach, Stähelin, and others he delivered popular lectures in Basel in 1860–61 in vindication of the Christian faith (Eng. transl., *The Foundations of our Faith*, Edinburgh, 1863), and here he first brought out his chief literary work, *Die Lehre von der Person Christi* (1856), with three supplementary articles "On the Atonement" in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1857–59. He aims to set forth the conceivableness of the union "of the complete humanity and the real divinity in Christ," especially in the light of Phil. ii. 5 sqq.; and to prove "how completely a demonstration, once apprehended with ethical profundity, of the righteousness of God in the fact of Christ's death, corresponds to the needs of the human conscience, and accords with the holy love of God." In connection with his lectures in Göttingen he began to rewrite the work entirely *de novo* and as the result published first *Christi Selbstzeugniss* (Basel, 1870); a second part, *Das apostolische Zeugniss von Christi Person und Werk*, followed in two volumes (1878–1879), the first treating of Paul's views and influence, the second of the apostolic testimony after Paul's labors; a third and concluding part, *Dogmatische Verarbeitung des Zeugnisses Christi und der apostolischen Zeugnisse*, also entitled *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk entwickelt aus Christi Selbstzeugniss und den Zeugnissen der Apostel* appeared in 1887. His last work, *Die Inspiration der Helden der Bibel und der Schriften der Bibel* was issued in 1891 by his son, Ernst Gess, pastor in Berlin, after his death.

The solution of the problem, "how he who was born as very man can be the same person with him who had glory with the Father before the foundation of the world, who was as God with God" (vol. iii., p. 254), constituted the literary life-work of Gess. "Christ's actual acknowledgment of the righteousness of God by silent and humble endurance of the sentence of condemnation, is the mainspring of his messianic work" (iii. 144). The expression that with the Son of God all variableness is excluded, is "only a theological construction, not a canon of Christ, Paul, John" (iii. 352). The "great transformation" took place in him, "in that he passed over from the life of the absolute, or self-constituent, into the life of the transposed, or objectively constituted" (p. 353). Just as with the children of men God creates the soul at the instant of conception, and the divinely created spirit unites with the bodily nature engendered by man and woman, so "with Jesus the Logos-Nature unites with the corporal nature as conceived in Mary by the Holy Ghost." Thus arises "the resemblance of Jesus to his mother" (p. 360). So, too, his vital development is conditioned by the gradual maturing of his bodily organism (p. 367). Again, his sanctification remained "the act of real freedom; that is, the freedom of choosing between contrasted or opposing possibilities" (p. 369). "He was still in the process of learning, even in Gethsemane (Heb. v. 7 sqq.). He was doing the same on the cross. Only with his death was his voluntary sanctification, together with the Atone-

ment, completed" (p. 370). After glorification he lives in the body, "mediates all his world work, even his triune relationship, through his body.
Nay more, even his soul's life itself maintains the impress that was stamped upon it by his earthly career; his holiness, his love, his mercy, though divine, is at the same time accounted human" (p. 411).

Of the minor works of Gess, the *Bibelstunden* on the last discourses of Jesus (Basel, 1871) reached a fifth edition in 1894, and those on the Epistle to the Romans (2 vols., 1885–88) a second edition in 1892. He also published several volumes of lectures.

WILHELM SCHMIDT.

GETHSEMANE. See JERUSALEM, V., § 5.

GEZELIUS, ge-zê'li-us, **JOHANNES:** The name of two bishops of Abo, Finland.

1. Johannes Gezelius the Elder was born at Romfertuna, Westmanland, Sweden, 1615; d. 1690. He studied at Dorpat from 1632 and became professor of Greek and Hebrew there in 1641. As such he lectured diligently and published text-books of which there was a great need at that time. About 1649 he became provost at Skedevi in Oestergötland, Sweden, where he devoted himself with diligence to the service of the congregation, and also gathered students around him and held lectures. On the recommendation of Count M. G. de le Gardie he was appointed general superintendent in Livonia and vice-chancellor of the University of Dorpat. Owing to his energy and efficiency, he was made bishop in Abo in 1664, where he found his real life-work. He was intent upon raising the standard of education among the Finnish preachers, required a theological examination of all who intended to enter the ministry, and ordered all preachers to introduce church registers with the names of all church-members. Of people who intended to marry, he required a knowledge of Luther's catechism. Every family was to be provided with a hymn-book, a book of prayer and meditations. He exerted himself to teach his people to read, and paid much attention to the education of children. He had his own printing establishment in which most of the Finnish publications of the time were printed. He showed impatience of the opinions of others, however, and his reluctance to grant liberty of conscience to Pietists is not frec from blame. He published many text-books, and one on the Greek language (1647) was much used. For his preachers he published a *Fasciculus homileticarum dispositionum annis circiter XXVII seorsim editarum* (1693) and *Casuum conscientiæ et præcipuorum quæstionum practicarum decisiones* (1689). He also started a great work on the Bible which was continued by his son.

2. Johannes Gezelius the Younger, son of the former, was born in 1647; d. 1718. He entered the university in 1661. In 1670 he received a royal stipend to go abroad for the completion of his studies, and visited Germany, Holland, England, and France. Immediately after his return, he was appointed professor extraordinary in the University of Abo. In 1681 he became superintendent in Ingermanland. In 1689 his aged father called him back to Abo to be his assistant, and the next year he became his successor. He faithfully continued his father's labors and devoted much time to the great work on the Bible; but he also was not able to finish it. The New Testament appeared during his lifetime (1711–13), the Old Testament after his death (1724–28). In 1711 he fled before the invading Russians to Stockholm, where he remained until his death. His attitude toward the Pietists was as haughty and intolerant as that of his father.

(J. A. CEDERBERG.)

GEZER, gî'zer.

Documentary History (§ 1).
Excavations; the Troglodytic Period (§ 2).
Semitic Period to the Exile (§ 3).
Syro-Greek Period (§ 4).
Results of Excavation (§ 5).

The city of Gezer, known from the Old Testament as a stronghold of the Canaanites or frontier fortress of the Philistines, has acquired no slight interest at present owing to the thorough and scientific excavations, covering about half the area, carried on there during 1902–05 by R. A. S. Macalister for the Palestine Exploration Fund. It is the modern Tel-Jezar, 18 m. w. in a direct line from Jerusalem, 20 m. s.e. of Jaffa, to the north of the railroad, near the foot of the hills which border the extreme northeast of the Plain of Philistia. The name is in the list of names of places in Palestine left by Thothmes III. at Karnak (c. 1500 B.C.) as held by him under an Egyptian governor. In the Amarna Tablets it figures frequently, part of the time as loyal and furnishing provisions to Jerusalem (then a city asserting its fidelity to the Egyptians), later as among the enemies of Ebed-tob, king of Jerusalem, and unfaithful to the Egyptian overlord. The inscription of the Pharaoh Meneptah (c. 1280 B.C.) mentions the city, though the meaning of the inscription is not clear in this part, since it has been rendered as saying that Gezer was captured by the Egyptians, and on the other hand that it was taken by the Ashkelonites. According to Josh. x. 33, xii. 2, its king and people were defeated by Joshua, and the city itself was assigned (theoretically) to Ephraim (Josh. xvi. 3) and to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxi. 21), though it was not captured by the Hebrews but became tributary to them (Josh. xvi. 10; Judges i. 29). In II Sam. v. 25 it appears as the limit of David's pursuit of the Philistines. According to I Kings ix. 15–16 it figures as the conquest of a Pharaoh who assigned it to his daughter, the consort of Solomon. Solomon strengthened its fortifications and it became an important fortress, commanding one of the principal routes from the coast to Jerusalem. Because of this fact it was in Maccabean times, under the name Gazara, the object of constant struggle between the Syrians and Maccabees (I Macc. iv. 15, vii. 45, ix. 52, xiii. 43, 53, xiv. 7, 34, xv. 28; II Macc. x. 32). It is the Mont Gisart of the period of the Crusades, where Baldwin V gained the victory over Saladin in 1177. Its site was identified by C. Clermont-Ganneau in 1873,

1. Documentary History.

who discovered there three bilingual inscriptions in Greek and Hebrew, one has the phrase "Boundary of Gezer."

The results of the recent excavations are in a measure checked and confirmed by excavations at Tel-Hesy, Taanak, and Megiddo, though the value of the Gezer excavations is in some respects far greater than at either of the other places named because of the continuous history uncovered and the greater antiquity to which that history is traced. No less than eight stages in the story of the population of Palestine are revealed in these researches, as represented by eight series of dwellings. The lowest of these stages is referred to troglodytes of a period about 3000 B.C. or earlier, the latest to a period about 100 B.C. The two lowest strata involve the existence of two series of cave-dwellers, of low stature, averaging little above five feet two inches in height; they inhabited a chain of underground chambers somewhat extensive in plan, used flint and bone weapons of the neolithic type, domesticated the cow, pig, sheep, and goat, sacrificed the pig to an underground deity, and eremated their dead; the later of them employed extensively the yoni as a religious emblem. The city of this period was defended by walls of earth faced with stone.

2. Excavations; The Troglodytic Period.

The next two periods, covering perhaps 2500–1200 B.C., are early Semitic; the people ranged in height from five feet seven inches to five feet eleven inches, flint is gradually replaced by bronze while iron begins to appear toward the end, and the female phallic emblems of the previous period are replaced by those of the male type. One of the distinguishing features of this period is a "high place" on which a megalithic temple is indicated in a series of rough stone pillars, ten in number, of which eight remain, while the places of the other two are marked, these ten being separated by an interval into groups of three and seven. Of the eight still standing seven are of native stone, while the other has been brought from a distance, and is still marked by a groove which perhaps held the ropes by which it was dragged. These pillars range in height from five feet five inches to ten feet six, and one of them shows clear traces of having been an object of worship. The city wall of these periods and the next was of stone, fourteen feet in thickness and nearly a mile in circumference. These two strata, as well as the one immediately preceding, yielded many scarabs, most of them belonging to the middle kingdom of Egypt, and in particular abundance rude pottery images of a cow—the emblem of fertility and connected with Astarte. This period also yielded several examples of the foundation sacrifice, including infants, a young girl, and an aged and deformed woman and an old man. Some such cult as Moloch-worship is implied by the many charred remains of skeletons of infants. One object belonging to the end of this period is a masonry box-tomb with objects of art in silver and alabaster and a mirror, an exotic suggesting perhaps the Philistine occupation. The fifth and sixth strata cover the Hebraic period, the fifth being apparently that of the city destroyed by the Pharaoh of I Kings ix. 16, and the next the Gezer of the Hebrew regal period. In this age foundation sacrifice was merely symbolical, indicated by deposition of bowls without the skeleton. The end of this age, corresponding to the Assyrian occupation, is represented by two tablets in the cuneiform, neither of them entire, but both dated, one either 649 or 651 B.C., the other two years later. The first relates to the sale of an estate of which a slave and his family formed part, and the governor is Hur-wasi, an Egyptian name, regarded as showing, when taken in conjunction with other Egyptian remains, Egyptian control of the city continuously from Solomonic times. The second records the sale of a field by a Hebrew named Nethaniah. The record of dealings in the Assyrian script under an Egyptian governor repeats the characteristic of the Amarna Tablets.

3. Semitic Period to the Exile.

The seventh period is the Syro-Greek, including the Maccabean age. Characteristic of this is a votive altar, bearing on one side a dedication to Heracles, on the other the name Yahweh in its Greek form. This reflects the religious eclecticism of the pre-Maccabean age in which Jason the high priest led in promoting the circulation of Greek ideas. A result of the excavations here is the uncovering of the bastions added to the wall by the Syrian occupants and of the palace or castle of Simon, identified by a graffito of limestone with inscription in rude Greek, reading probably, "(Says) Pampras, may fire follow Simon's palace!" This is interpreted as a magic charm made by a hater of that ruler. The eighth stratum is that of the late Syrian, pre-Roman occupation, after the palace of Simon had been destroyed and on its site a structure reared in which a remarkable series of baths with basins and drain and furnace existed.

4. Syro-Greek Period.

The special results of the excavation are the following: (1) The tracing of successive populations backward to the earliest troglodytic inhabitants; (2) the existence of continuous traces of Egyptian occupation from the second troglodytic population (a scarab of Usertesen III., c. 2500 B.C.) to about the middle of the seventh pre-Christian century, including an inscribed statuette of the period of the twelfth dynasty, four and one-eighth inches in height; (3) the existence of a high place where the worship of Astarte is abundantly indicated, especially by a bronze statuette of two-horned Astarte and by numerous phallic emblems; (4) the votive altar already described; (5) the possibility that an inscribed sherd carries back Phenician writing four centuries earlier than the Baal-Hermon inscriptions (c. 600 B.C.) to an age when it was written boustrophedon like the early Greek and the Hittite inscriptions; (6) the illustration of many Biblical features, such as the "tongue" of gold (R.V., "wedge," Josh. vii. 21), two ingots of gold in this form being discovered, one of them being fifty-two shekels in weight. Of gold and silver objects comparatively few were found, but bronze was relatively abundant: the pottery, while fragmentary, is valuable for its

5. Results of Excavation.

epigraphic illustration of Hebrew names and perhaps also of Hebrew genealogy.

GEO. W GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archæological Researches in Palestine*, ii. 257, London, 1881; idem, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, i. 351–391, Paris, 1885; PEF, *Quarterly Statements*, 1903–date, particularly that for July, 1907, giving latest results; R. A. S. Macalister, *Bible Side Lights from the Mound of Gezer*, London, 1906; H. Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'exploration récente*, pp. 109 sqq., Paris, 1907

GFROERER, gfrū'rer, **AUGUST FRIEDRICH:** German historian; b. at Calw (20 m. w.s.w. of Stuttgart) Mar. 5, 1803; d. at Carlsbad July 6, 1861. He studied theology at Tübingen, where he became repetent in 1828, after he had spent three years in Switzerland and Italy. In 1829 he became Stadtvicar at Stuttgart, and in 1830 librarian at the royal library there. He then definitely abandoned the ministry and devoted himself to historical studies. In 1846 he was appointed professor of history at Freiburg, and in 1848 was elected to the German parliament, in which he distinguished himself as an adherent of the "Grossdeutsche" party and an opponent of Prussia. After failing in an attempt at Frankfort to unite Protestants and Catholics he joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1853. He had already been long recognized as one of the leaders of the Ultramontane party in Germany. His principal works are, *Philo und die jüdisch-Alexandrinische Theosophie* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1831); *Gustav Adolf und seine Zeit* (2 vols., 1835–37); *Geschichte des Urchristentums* (3 vols., 1838); *Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte* (4 vols., 1841–46); *Geschichte der ost- und westfränkischen Karolinger* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1848); *Urgeschichte des menschlichen Geschlechts* (2 vols., Schaffhausen, 1855); and *Papst Gregorius VII. und sein Zeitalter* (7 vols., Schaffhausen, 1859–61; index vol., 1864).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Alberdingk Thijm, *A. F. Gfrörer en zijne werken*, Haarlem, 1870; *KL*, v. 579–580.

GIANTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT: The passages in the Old Testament where the word giant or its equivalents occur may be differentiated into two classes: (1) those which adduce sporadic cases of exceptional stature or strength, against which no a priori historical objection can lie (such as I Sam. xvii.); (2) those in which a mythological or early legendary character is clearly in evidence. The first class requires no discussion here. In considering the second class preliminary notes of importance are (1) that in the canonical writings there are but fugitive references to what was probably a much larger body of current folk-lore, which entered literature extensively only in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (H. Gunkel, *Genesis*, Göttingen, 1901, p. 52); and (2) that illumination is received from comparison with like myths of other peoples.

In the Old Testament two words convey the idea of giants, *Nephilim* (Gen. vi. 4, J; Num. xiii. 33, JE), and *Repha'im* (Gen. xiv. 5, from a special source; Deut. ii. 10–12, 20, 21, iii. 11; II Sam. xxi. 16–21). The passage Gen. vi. 1–4 stands alone in the canonical writings in speaking of a race of giants which sprang from a union of angels ("sons of God," the "watchers" of the Pseudepigrapha) and women ("daughters of men"). This narrative is an etiological myth accounting to the Hebrew mind for the giants already known to common folk-lore. Its *motif* is taken up in the pseudepigraphic literature, especially that which gathered about the name of Enoch. In the other passages the terms *Nephilim* and *Repha'im*, used as inclusive of *Emim*, *Zuzim*, *'Anaḳim*, and *Horim*, signify the autochthonous inhabitants of Palestine (in its larger sense of the region both east and west of the Jordan), the predecessors of the Canaanites from whom the Hebrews took the land. The philological notion underlying *Nephilim* is not satisfactorily determined. *Repha'im* is connected with the word meaning "shade" or "ghost," and thus fits absolutely with the mythological references to the extinct races supposed to have inhabited the land. Other particulars agree with this interpretation. Thus the reference in Deut. iii. 11 to the bed (better "sarcophagus," so Schaff, *Bible Dictionary*, New York, 1880) of Og, king of Bashan, probably a coffin-shaped block of basalt ("iron"), is to be put alongside similar objects elsewhere, such as the Giant's Causeway, a name embodying a primitive explanation of a strange feature of the Irish landscape.

In ethnic myths the earlier inhabitants of earth are pictured as of more than human stature and strength, and often as living beyond the usual span of human life. Thus in India the first Jina is said to have been 3,000 feet in height and to have lived eight millions of years. Another characteristic of these myths is that the giants come into conflict with the gods and are destroyed. Examples of this are the Marduk-Tiamat myth of Babylonia and the Gigantomachia and Titanomachia of Greece. In Hebrew legend these characteristics are separated; the lengthened span of life is assigned to antediluvians in general, abnormal stature is attributed to the prehistoric race in canonical literature, the contest of the giants with God appears first in the Apocrypha (Ecclus. xvi. 7) and develops enormously in the Pseudepigrapha. Wisd. of Sol. xiv. 6 has a curious explanation of the survival of the flood by the giants, and rabbinic literature explains in equally grotesque fashion the survival of Og. In such passages as Baruch iii. 26–28, III Macc. ii. 4, Enoch vii. 2–4, and Jubilees vii. these varied characteristics appear. The "sons of God" were angels of high estate who fell, and the idea was perpetuated and finds its extreme expression in Christian literature in Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

It may be noted that among the *Repha'im* were the *Horim*, generally explained as "troglodytes," and that excavations in Palestine as elsewhere shows the cave-dwellers to have been of low stature (see GEZER).

GEO. W GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. L. Porter, *Giant Cities of Bashan*, New York, 1871; F. Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'histoire*, 2 vols., Paris, 1880–84, Eng. transl. of vol. i., London, 1883; E. Meyer, in *ZATW*, i (1881), 139, and Schwally in the same, xviii (1898), 127 sqq.; K. Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, pp. 30 sqq., Giessen, 1883; H. E. Ryle, *Early Narratives of Genesis*, London, 1892; S. R. Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, on Deut. iii. 11, New York, 1895; C. R. Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 333–334, ib. 1899; *DB*, i. 90 ("Anakim"), ii. 166–168, iii. 512 ("Nephi-

lim "); *EB*, i. 161–162, iii. 3391 sqq.; *JE*, v. 656–658; the literature on Enoch and Baruch under PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.

GIBB, JOHN: English Presbyterian; b. at Aberdeen, Scotland, Dec. 14, 1835. He studied in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and Heidelberg, and after being assistant minister at the Presbyterian church at Malta 1863–67, was theological tutor in the College of the Presbyterian Church in England, London, 1868–77 Since 1877 he has been professor of New Testament theology and ecclesiastical history in Westminster College, Cambridge. He has written *Biblical Studies and their Influence upon the Church* (London, 1877) and *Gudrun, Beowolf, and the Song of Roland* (1884), and has translated selections from Luther's " Table Talk " (London, 1883) and St. Augustine's " Homilies on the Gospel of John " (Edinburgh, 1873), in addition to editing the " Confessions " of St. Augustine in collaboration with W. Montgomery (Cambridge, 1906).

GIBBON, EDWARD: The historian of the Roman Empire; b. at Putney (7 m. w.s.w. of St. Paul's, London), Surrey, Apr. 27, 1737; d. in London Jan. 16, 1794. For his early training he was indebted chiefly to his aunt, Catherine Porten, from whom he received that taste for books which, he says, was the pleasure and glory of his life. In Jan., 1749, he entered Westminster School, but had to leave it in Dec., 1750, on account of ill health. A glance into Eachard's *Roman History* in 1751 started him on a wide course of historical reading. In Apr., 1752, he entered Magdalen College, Oxford, where he spent what he considered the fourteen most unprofitable months of his life. His brief career at Oxford was terminated by his temporary conversion to Roman Catholicism, which was accomplished by Middleton's *Free Enquiry* (London, 1749) and works of Bossuet and the Jesuit Robert Parsons (q.v.). On June 8, 1753, he was received into the Roman fold by a Jesuit priest in London. He at once acquainted his father with this fact, who placed him first in the home of David Mallet, at Putney, but sent him to Lausanne, Switzerland, almost immediately to the care of M. Pavillard, a Calvinistic minister, under whose tutelage Gibbon quickly renounced Roman Catholicism. He returned to England in August, 1758, and took up his abode at Buriton, near Petersfield, Hampshire, whither his father had removed in 1747. An attachment which he had formed at Lausanne for Susanne Curchod, afterward Madame Necker and mother of Madame de Staël, was now broken off, owing to his father's objection to the match. Gibbon's subsequent behavior toward Mlle. Curchod was condemned by Rousseau. On June 12, 1759, he became captain in the Hampshire militia. From May, 1760, to Dec., 1762, he was quartered in various towns in the southern counties. He retained his commission till 1770, becoming major and colonel commandant. This experience gave him robust health and a knowledge of military affairs that stood him in good stead when he came to write of the phalanx and legion. He had now published his *Essai sur l'étude de la littérature* (London, 1761; Eng. transl., 1764). From Jan., 1763, to June, 1765, he traveled and studied on the Continent. " It was at Rome," he says, " on Oct. 15, 1764, as I sat musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol, while the barefooted friars were singing vespers in the temple of Jupiter that the idea of writing the decline and fall of the city first started into my mind." Having come into the possession of ample means on the death of his father in 1770, he settled in London in 1772 and began to write *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. In 1774 he became a member of Dr. Johnson's famous literary club, and on Oct. 11 of that year he was returned to Parliament for Liskeard, Cornwall. In Feb., 1776, he published the first volume of the *Decline and Fall*. Its success was as rapid as it has been lasting. To a number of attacks provoked by the theological chapters Gibbon replied in a *Vindication* (1779). Early in 1779 he was employed by the ministry to write a Mémoire Justificatif (1779) in answer to a French manifesto; and in the summer of 1779 he was given the lucrative sinecure of commissioner of trades and plantations, which he held till the office was abolished in 1782. In Apr., 1781, he published the second and third volumes of his history. On June 25, 1781, he was returned to Parliament for Lymington, that body having been dissolved Sept. 1, 1780. In Sept., 1783, he settled at Lausanne. Near midnight of the 27th of June, 1787, sitting in the summer-house in his garden, he wrote the last sentence of his monumental work. The last three volumes were published on his fifty-first birthday, thus completing *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (6 vols., London, 1776–88; best ed. by J. B. Bury, 7 vols., 1896–1900). Gibbon came to London to see the work through the press, but returned to Lausanne in July, 1788. He resided there till Apr., 1793, when he returned to England to visit his friend, Lord Sheffield, whose wife had just died. His own death came unexpectedly, following upon a series of operations for hydrocele. He was laid in the burial-place of the Sheffield family, Fletching, Sussex. Lord Sheffield published his *Miscellaneous Works* (2 vols., London, 1796; 5 vols., 1814), which include his excellent autobiography, *Memoirs of my Life and Writings* (ed. O. F. Emerson, Boston, 1898; ed. G. B. Hill, London, 1900; ed., with introduction, J. B. Bury, London, 1907). Sheffield's grandson, Earl of Sheffield, has published the six different manuscripts from which the *Memoirs* were compiled (London, 1896), and also prefixed an introduction to Gibbon's *Private Letters* (ed. R. E. Prothero, 2 vols., 1896).

The *Decline and Fall*, which covers the period extending from about the middle of the second century to the year 1453, has, by unanimous consent, been placed in the very front rank of historical works. For accuracy, thoroughness, lucidity, and comprehensive grasp of a vast subject, it has never been surpassed. While later researches have corrected Gibbon in a few details, they have not materially changed the picture drawn by him. His work is perhaps the one history in English that may be regarded as definitive. The only charge that has ever been successfully brought against it is that it betrays an unfriendly animus to Christianity; but Gibbon had so little sympathy with the aims of

the Church that it was not to be expected that he would throw the mantle of charity over the foibles and failings of churchmen. In regard to the famous fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, which relate to the rise and spread of Christianity, wherein its success is explained by reference to secondary causes, and the severity of its early trials declared to have been overestimated, it may be remarked that Gibbon himself admitted that his array of secondary causes left the question of the divine origin of Christianity untouched; and, now that the smoke of the battle against this portion of the history has cleared away, church historians allow the substantial justness of his main positions. In Gibbon's lifetime the work was translated into German, French, and Italian. It has also been translated, in part, into Magyar, modern Greek, Polish, and Russian.

Bibliography: Besides the *Memoirs* and *Private Letters*, ut sup., consult the biography by J. C. Morison, in *English Men of Letters*, London, 1878; that by S. Walpole, *Studies in Biography*, New York, 1907; and *DNB*, xxi. 250–256.

GIBBONS, JAMES: Cardinal; b. at Baltimore, Md., July 23, 1834. He received his early education in Ireland, but returned to the United States in 1851, and lived for several years in New Orleans. He studied at St. Charles' College, Ellicott City, Md. (1855–57), and at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore (1857–61). He was ordained priest in 1861, and after being assistant at St. Patrick's, Baltimore, for a few months, was appointed rector of St. Bridget's, Canton (a suburb of Baltimore), where he remained until 1865. He was private secretary to Archbishop Spalding 1865–68, and was also chancellor of the archdiocese 1866–68. He was assistant chancellor of the Second Plenary Council of the American Roman Catholic Church held at Baltimore in 1866, and in 1868 was consecrated titular bishop of Adramytum and appointed vicar apostolic of North Carolina. In 1872 he was translated to the see of Richmond, Va., and after five years became archbishop coadjutor with right of succession to Archbishop Bailey of Baltimore. Five months later he succeeded to the see, thus becoming the primate of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. He presided over the Third Plenary Council at Baltimore in 1884, and two years later was created cardinal. On account of his advancing years, Bishop Curtis, formerly of Wilmington, Del., was appointed to assist him in 1896. He has written *The Faith of our Fathers* (New York, 1871); *Our Christian Heritage* (Baltimore, Md., 1889); and *The Ambassador of Christ* (1896).

GIBERTI, jî-bār'tî, GIOVANNI MATTEO: A reforming prelate of the sixteenth century; b. at Palermo 1495; d. at Verona Dec. 30, 1543. Being appointed by Clement VII. apostolic datary, he became a member of the Oratory of Divine Love at Rome. In 1524 he was made bishop of Verona, but he did not enter upon his episcopal duties until 1528. He endeavored to raise the educational and moral standard of the clergy and to enforce the discipline of the religious orders. In the work *Constitutiones ecclesiasticæ* and in various treatises, ordinances, and letters, he proposed far-reaching measures of reform. But he was obstinately opposed by both the secular clergy and the religious orders; and the famous *Concilium de emendanda ecclesia* (1537), in whose authorship, besides Contarini and Caraffa, Giberti was also concerned, produced no result. After entering upon his episcopal duties, Giberti had one more important commission outside his diocese, going to the Colloquy of Worms (1540) as papal legate. It was intended that he should act in a similar capacity at the Council of Trent, but his sudden death prevented this. His works were published in Verona 1733, 1740; his official correspondence in Guicciardini, *Opere inedite*, iv., v (Florence, 1863). K. Benrath.

Bibliography: A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, vol. iii., part 2, passim, Berlin, 1870; Dittrich, in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, vi (1886), 1–50; Creighton, *Papacy*, vi. 278–291, 308–309.

GIBSON, EDGAR CHARLES SUMNER: Bishop of Gloucester; b. at Southampton Jan. 23, 1848. He studied at Trinity College, Oxford (B.A., 1870), and Wells Theological College (1871–72), and was ordained priest in 1872. He was chaplain of Wells Theological College 1871–74, vice-principal of the same institution and curate of Dinder 1874–76, lecturer at Leeds Clergy School 1876–80, principal of Wells Theological College 1880–95, and vicar and rural dean of Leeds 1895–1905. In 1905 he was consecrated bishop of Gloucester. He was also prebendary of Wells Cathedral 1880–1905, lecturer on pastoral theology at Cambridge 1893–94, select preacher at Oxford 1893–95, examining chaplain to the bishop of Bath and Wells 1894–1904, honorary chaplain to Queen Victoria 1901, chaplain in ordinary to King Edward VII. 1901–05, Warburton Lecturer of Lincoln's Inn 1903, and a member of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline and commissary to the bishops of North China and Shan-tung 1904. In theology he is a liberal High-churchman. He has written *Northumbrian Saints* (London, 1884); *Commentary on St. James* in *The Pulpit Commentary* (1886); *Self-Discipline* (1894); *The Thirty-Nine Articles Explained* (2 vols., 1896–1897); *Commentary on the Book of Job* (1898;) *John Howard* (1901); and *Messages from the Old Testament* (1904). He also translated the works of Cassianus for the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library* (Edinburgh, 1894) and edited George Herbert's *Temple* (London, 1899).

GIBSON, EDMUND: Bishop of London; b. at Bampton (24 m. s.s.e. of Carlisle), Westmoreland, Dec., 1669; d. at Bath Sept. 6, 1748. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford (B.A., 1691; M.A., 1694), where he was given a fellowship. His early interest in Anglo-Saxon and British antiquities led to a friendship with Archbishop Tenison, who made him his domestic chaplain and got him the librarianship at Lambeth. Through Tenison's influence Gibson became lecturer at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, rector of Stisted in Essex (1700), and rector of Lambeth (1703). He sided with Tenison in the controversy between the two houses of convocation and within three years published ten tracts in support of the upper house. He became archdeacon of Surrey in 1710, bishop of

Lincoln in 1716, and bishop of London in 1723. For years he was the intimate friend and chief adviser of Sir Robert Walpole in ecclesiastical matters. His crusade against court masquerades and his opposition to Walpole's Quakers' Relief Bill cost him the appointment to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1737 Ten years later the archbishopric was offered him, but he declined on account of age and infirmity. Besides tracts, sermons, and pastoral letters, some of which were directed against deists, freethinkers, and Methodists, his principal publications were, *Synodus Anglicani, or the Constitution and Proceedings of an English Convocation* (London, 1702: ed. E. Cardwell, Oxford, 1854), which now forms the text-book for all proceedings in convocation; *Codex juris ecclesiastici Anglicani; or the Statutes, Constitutions, Canons, Rubrics, and Articles of the Church of England* (2 vols., 1713), a monument of research and still the highest authority on church law; and *A Preservative against Popery* (3 vols., 1734; ed. J. Cumming, 18 vols., 1848–49; *Supplement*, 8 vols., 1849), a collection of treatises on the subject by various eminent English divines.

Bibliography: *Some Account of . . Dr. E. Gibson*, London, 1749 (by R. Smalbroke?); W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Horatio Lord Walpole*, vol. ii., London, 1808; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iv. 540, London, 1820; *DNB*, xxi. 274–275; J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church, 1714–1800*, pp. 99–120 et passim, London, 1906.

GIBSON, JOHN MONRO: English Presbyterian; b. at Whithorn (9 m. s. of Wigtown), Gallowayshire, Scotland, Apr. 24, 1838. He studied at the University of Toronto (B.A., 1862) and Knox College, Toronto, from which he was graduated in 1864. He was classical tutor in Knox College 1864 and pastor of Erskine Church, Montreal, 1864–74, as well as lecturer in Old and New Testament exegesis in the Presbyterian College, Montreal, 1868–74. He was then pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Chicago, 1874–80, and since 1880 has been pastor of St. John's Wood Presbyterian Church, London. He was moderator of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England in 1891 and president of the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches in England and Wales in 1898, of which he was also honorary secretary 1898–1905. He is an honorary secretary of the Religious Tract Society, and in theology is a liberal Evangelical, although he holds firmly to the cardinal truths of Christianity. He has written *Ages before Moses* (New York, 1879); *The Foundations* (lectures on the evidences of Christianity; Chicago, 1880); *The Mosaic Era* (London, 1881); *Rock versus Sand* (1883); *Pomegranates from an English Garden* (New York, 1885); *Christianity according to Christ* (London, 1888); *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* in *The Expositor's Bible* (1890); *Acts* in *People's Bible History* (1895); *Unity and Symmetry of the Bible* (1896); *From Fact to Faith* (1898); *A Strong City and Other Sermons* (1899); *The Glory of Life* (1900); *Apocalyptic Sketches* (1901); *Protestant Principles* (1901); and *The Devotional Study of Holy Scripture* (1905).

GIBSON, MARGARET DUNLOP: English Orientalist; b. at Irvine (22 m. s.w. of Glasgow), Ayrshire, Scotland. She was the daughter of John Smith, solicitor, Irvine, Ayrshire, was educated at private schools and by university tutors, and in 1883 married Rev. James Young Gibson, who died three years later. She has visited Sinai five times, and in company with her sister, Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis, has made important discoveries of Arabic and Syriac manuscripts of the Bible, among them the justly celebrated and important Sinaitic Syriac codex of the Gospels, upon which both have done excellent work. A rigid Presbyterian and very decidedly Protestant, she and her sister gave the site for Westminster Theological College, Cambridge, and laid its corner-stone in 1897. She has edited *An Arabic Version of St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians* (London, 1894); *Apocrypha Sinaitica* (1896); *An Arabic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Seven Catholic Epistles* (1899); *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels* (in collaboration with Mrs. Lewis, 1899); *Apocrypha Arabica* (1901); and *The Didascalia Apostolorum* (Syriac text and translation; 2 vols., 1903); and has written, in addition to a number of tracts, *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Convent of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai* (London, 1894).

GIBSON, ROBERT ATKINSON: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Virginia; b. at Petersburg, Va., July 9, 1846. After serving as a private in the First Virginia Artillery of the Confederate Army 1864–65, he was graduated at Hampden-Sidney College in 1867, and at the Virginia Theological Seminary in 1870. He became a missionary in southern Virginia, 1870, assistant of St. James' and curate of Moore Memorial Chapel, Richmond, Va., 1872; rector of Trinity Church, Parkersburg, W Va., 1878, of Christ Church, Cincinnati, O., 1887. He was consecrated sixth bishop of Virginia, 1897

GICHTEL, gĭH'tel, **JOHANN GEORG:** German ascetic and mystic; b. at Regensburg May 14, 1638; d. at Amsterdam Jan. 21, 1710. He was a descendant of a Protestant family, and the religious impulse was awakened in him at an early age. He studied theology and history at Strasburg, but after the death of his father he took up the study of law and settled in Regensburg as a lawyer, but his religious life received a new impulse through his association with Justinian Ernst von Weltz (q.v.), a Hungarian baron who was endeavoring to propagate his ideas concerning a reformation of the Church, a reconciliation between the Lutherans and Reformed, and a revival of missionary activity. They aroused the suspicion of the orthodox clergy, however, and were denounced as fanatics. Weltz now resolved upon a missionary tour to South America and was accompanied by Gichtel as far as Holland. There mysticism, the natural trend of his religious development and disposition, claimed him for his own, and Friedrich Breckling, a mystic preacher in Zwolle, exerted a decisive influence upon him.

The external church service now seemed to Gichtel an obstacle to inner communion with God, and he felt himself called to take up the battle

against false church service, especially in Lutheranism. After his return to Germany he addressed to his native city a letter filled with violent accusations against the clergy, whereupon he was imprisoned, deprived of all civic rights, and exiled. In 1665 he began his wanderings, and after a short stay at the residence of Pistorius, a Pietistic preacher of Gersbach in Baden, he went to Vienna to settle some business affairs of Weltz. In 1667 he returned to Zwolle, where Breckling employed him as chaplain, leader of the choir, and porter, but he became involved in Breckling's dissensions with his congregation and the consistory, and was exiled from Zwolle and the whole province of Upper Yssel. He spent the remainder of his life quietly in Amsterdam, winning many converts to his views. At first he earned his living by translating and proof-reading, but renounced even this work as incompatible with the trust which leaves all care to God.

Gichtel was opposed to sects of his time such as Quakers, Mennonites, and Labadists, nor was it his desire to found a sect. Violent dissensions arose among his followers, and at last only two of his friends remained—Isaak Passavant and Johann Wilhelm Ueberfeld. After Gichtel's death, Ueberfeld became the leader of his Dutch adherents, while his followers in Hamburg and Altona were headed by Johann Otto Glüsing. Gichtel's writings were regarded by them as equal to the Bible, and he himself was considered an elect instrument of God. Traces of the sect were also found in Berlin, Magdeburg, and Nordhausen.

In Amsterdam Gichtel became acquainted with the works of Böhme, which he declared to be on a par with the Bible, and his ideas were molded by his study of this mystic, especially his discourses on the struggle between the love and the wrath of God, on creation, on the fall of Lucifer and Adam. Like all the radical mystics of his period, he maintained a polemical attitude toward the established Church and toward the Reformation, which in his opinion had contented itself with the destruction of popery without putting anything better in its place, while with Böhme he shared the combination of Pietism and a mystical conception of nature. From his general contempt of learned writings were excepted only works on science "because of the light of nature." Gichtel strove to reduce the ideas of Böhme to practicality, and for this reason he rejected marriage, regarding it as unchastity in the sight of God and as a perversion of the original order of creation, advocating the priesthood of Melchisedeck, and believing that man by prayer and absorption into the death and blood of Jesus might offer his soul as a sacrifice for others. With others, especially with Alhardt de Raedt, a former professor of theology in Haderwijk, and with the financial aid of Coenraad van Beuningen, mayor of Amsterdam, Gichtel published the first complete edition of Böhme's works (Amsterdam, 1682). His own writings have been collected in seven volumes under the title of *Theosophia practica* (Leyden, 1722). (A. Hegler †.) K. Holl.

Bibliography: A life is contained in G. C. A. von Harless, *Jakob Böhme und die Alchymisten*, Leipsic, 1882; and the *Theosophia practica*, Leyden, 1722, contains both his works and a sketch of his life. Consult also: Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, section 1, lxv. 437 sqq.; *ADB*, ix. 147–150

GIDEON (Septuagint, *Gedeon*, also called *Jerubbaal*): One of the "Judges of Israel." He was a son of Joash, and one of the great liberators of Israel. He made an end of the predatory excursions of the Midianites, who, like modern Arabs, regularly invaded the country before the harvest and carried away the produce. Judges vi.–viii. gives in detail his call in his native city Ophrah (the modern Far'ata, southwest from Nablus?), his experience, his preparation for the fight, his victory gained with help of a small band by surprising the enemy, his pursuit of the enemy over the Jordan and his second victory over the Midianite kings. On theocratic principles he refused the royal crown offered to him, a fact apparently confirmed by the ancient parable of Jotham. With the booty he made an ephod (Yahweh-image or oracle-dress, see Ephod), which according to the narrator caused the destruction of his house, through his son Abimelech, who killed the seventy sons of Gideon after the father's death. The name Jerubbaal is explained from a national standpoint vi. 31–32. Robertson Smith reads the verse differently (*Rel. of Sem.*, pp. 162–163) as "the man who wars with Baal (provided Baal is a god) must die before (the next) morning." There are Arabic parallels for this. Originally the name may have meant: "Great or strong is the Lord (Yahweh or Baal?)." In order not to mention Baal, the name was afterward called Jerubbosheth (II Sam. xi. 21).

In this narrative Gideon appears a hero of royal stature, devoted to his people, of bold, enduring fortitude and yet humble before God and free from vain ambition before men. Criticism has made it probable that the narrative which treats of him is a composite from different sources and contains besides the interpolations of the Deuteronomic redactor and later additions. Distinction is made between two main sources which the redactor of the book combined. To one narrative belong the history of Abimelech (chap. ix.) and viii. 4–21 (except the numbers in v. 10); and to the other (estimated as somewhat later) belong vi. 2–6a, 13–25; viii. 1–3, 24–27a. The section attributed to the first can not be an older version of the events recorded vi. 2–viii. 3. One would rather suppose that the stories of two campaigns of Gideon, a west-Jordanic and East-Jordanic, are united in the present narrative. Since in both narratives the house of Abiezer is especially mentioned, Studer and Wellhausen have supposed that the campaign of Gideon according to the original record was undertaken as a family blood-feud (viii. 18–19), whereas the reinforcements of the other tribes and the lessening of the force to 300 are later additions. But the characteristic narratives vii. 1 sqq. are certainly not by the redactor, and seem to have good parentage. While the religious motive appears in these narratives, there is no reason for regarding them as much later than the time they treat. That Gideon's achievement was regarded as memorable and as one of God's greatest deeds of deliverance is shown by Isa. ix. 4, x. 26; Ps. lxxxiii. 11. C. von Orelli.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sections in the accounts of the history of Israel as given under AHAB, the appropriate sections in the commentaries on Judges (see JUDGES), especially those by Bertheau, Budde and Moore, and *DB*, ii. 171–172; *EB*, ii. 1719–22; *JE*, v. 660–662; R. Kittel, *Studien zur hebräischen Archäologie*, i. 97–104, Leipsic, 1908.

GIESEBRECHT, gî″ze-breht, **FRIEDRICH WILHELM KARL:** German Protestant; b. at Kontopp (50 m. s.w. of Posen) July 30, 1852. He studied in Erlangen and Halle (Ph.D., 1876), and from 1876 to 1879 was in charge of the courses in Old Testament exegesis and adjunct at the royal seminary for canons at Berlin. In 1879 he beeame privatdocent at Greifswald, and was appointed associate professor of Old Testament exegesis in the same university in 1883. In 1895 he was made honorary professor there, and since 1898 has been professor of the same subject at Königsberg. He has written *Die hebräische Präposition Lamed* (Halle, 1876); *Der Wendepunkt des Buches Hiob* (Berlin, 1879); *Beiträge zur Jesaia-Kritik* (Göttingen, 1890); *Das Buch Jeremias übersetzt und erklärt* (1893); *Die Berufsbegabung der alttestamentlichen Propheten* (1897); *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes* (Königsberg, 1900); *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens* (1901); *Der "Knecht Jahves" des Deuterojesaia* (1902); *Friede für Babel und Bibel* (1903); *Grundzüge der israelitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Leipsic, 1904); *Die Metrik Jeremias* (Göttingen, 1905); and commentary on Jeremiah in *Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament* (1907).

GIESELER, gî′ze-ler, **JOHANN KARL LUDWIG:** Church historian; b. at Petershagen (on the Weser, 35 m. w. of Hanover), Prussia, Mar. 3, 1792; d. at Göttingen July 8, 1854. He attended the Latin school of the Orphans' House at Halle and the University of Halle. In 1812 he became collaborator in the Latin school, but the following year joined the German army at the outbreak of the war of liberation. In 1814 he resumed his activity as teacher, in 1817 he became doctor of philosophy and conrector at the gymnasium of Minden, 1818 director of the gymnasium at Cleves, and 1819 professor of theology at Bonn. In 1831 he went to Göttingen where he showed administrative talents besides ability as scholar and teacher. His lectures treated church history, history of dogma and dogmatics. Several times he was prorector of the university, he served on different commissions, and was member of the Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften; as curator of the orphans' home, he displayed much practical benevolence, and he was an active freemason. His principal work is his *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, one of the most remarkable productions of German learning, distinguished by erudition, accuracy, and careful selection of passages from the sources, given in footnotes. The first volume appeared at Darmstadt in 1824; the fifth and last, containing his lectures, and treating the period after 1814, at Bonn, 1857. An English translation from the earlier editions by F. Cunningham, was published at Philadelphia in three volumes, in 1836; another, from the last edition by S. Davidson, in five volumes at Edinburgh, 1848–56 (revised and edited by H. B. Smith and Mary A. Robinson, New York, 1857–81). The work is characterized by the fundamental principle that every age or period can be understood only in so far as we allow it to speak for itself; the chief task of the historian is to judge objectively and from the sources. His main strength lies therefore in the careful observation of details rather than in a grasp of the unity of events. His standpoint has been characterized as that of a historico-critical rationalism. Of his other writings may be mentioned: *Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Leipsic, 1818), against the hypothesis of a primal Aramaic *Urevangelium; Ueber den Reichstag zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530* (Hamburg, 1821); *Symbolæ ad historiam monasterii Lacensis* (Bonn, 1826); an edition of the history of the Manicheans of Petrus Siculus (Göttingen, 1846) and other works devoted to ancient or medieval church history. He treated of modern church history in *Rückblick auf die theologischen Richtungen der letzten fünfzig Jahre* (Göttingen, 1837), and *Ueber die Lehninsche Weissagung* (1849).

(N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A sketch of Gieseler's life by E. R. Reepenning is in the last vol. of the *Kirchengeschichte*, and such a sketch is in vol. i. of the Am. ed., New York, 1868. Consult: F. Oesterley, *Geschichte der Universität Göttingen*, pp. 410 sqq., Göttingen, 1838; *ADB*, ix. 163 sqq.

GIFFORD LECTURES: One of the most important lectureships yet created. Its founder was Adam, Lord Gifford of Edinburgh (d. 1887), an able Scotch jurist and judge of the Court of Sessions, noted not only for his knowledge of jurisprudence, but also for his interest in literature and philosophy. By his will, recorded in the year of his death, the sum of £80,000 was bequeathed to found a lectureship in Natural Theology at each of the Scotch universities, £25,000 going to Edinburgh, £20,000 each to Glasgow and Aberdeen, and £15,000 to St. Andrews. The terms of the foundation are noteworthy in that the lectures "may be of any religion or way of thinking, or (as is sometimes said) they may be of no religion, or they may be so-called skeptics or agnostics, or freethinkers." The sole qualification is ability to deal as specialists in Natural Theology in the widest sense of the term as a "strictly natural science." The freest research is allowed, without regard to tradition or established belief. The first lectures were delivered at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and St. Andrews in 1888, and at Aberdeen in 1889. Some of the most noted scholars of the century have taught on this foundation, among them John and Edward Caird and Andrew Lang of Scotland, F Max Müller and E. B. Tylor of England, Otto Pfleiderer of Germany, C. P Tiele of Holland, Emile Boutroux of France, R. A. Lanciani of Italy, and Josiah Royce of the United States. A full list of the lecturers and their subjects up to 1906 is given in L. H. Jordan, *Comparative Religion*, pp. 570–571, New York, 1905.

GIFFTHEIL, gift'hœil, **LUDWIG FRIEDRICH:** An enthusiast of the seventeenth century; d. at Amsterdam 1661. He was the son of an abbot in Württemberg, and became noted for his fanatical declamations against the established Church. His literary activity belongs to the period of the Thirty

Years' War. He stood in connection with Friedrich Breckling (q.v.) and other persons of the same description, published letters of warning to the rulers of Saxony and Brandenburg, Denmark and Sweden, England and Holland, Spain and France, and to Cromwell, whom he styled "field-marshal of the devil," while he called himself commander-in chief of the Lord Sabaoth. He published many works in Latin, German, English, and Dutch, which, like his actions, betray a passionate and vehement temperament. (F W DIBELIUS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Arnold, *Unparteiische Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*, iii., chap. x.; iv., sect. iii., no. 18, 4 vols., Frankfort, 1700–15.

GIFTS, SPIRITUAL. See CHARISMATA.

GILBERT, gil'bert, **GEORGE HOLLEY:** Congregationalist; b. at Cavendish, Vt., Nov. 4, 1854. He was graduated at Dartmouth College in 1878, Union Theological Seminary in 1883, and the University of Leipsic (Ph.D., 1885). He was professor of New Testament literature in Chicago Theological Seminary 1886–1901. He has written *The Poetry of Job* (Chicago, 1888); *The Student's Life of Jesus* (New York, 1899); *The Student's Life of Paul* (1899); *The Revelation of Jesus* (1900); *The First Interpreters of Jesus* (1901); *A Primer of the Christian Religion* (1902); and *A History of the Apostolic Age* (Chicago, 1906).

GILBERT, zhîl''bār', **DE LA PORRÉE,** pōr''rê' (*Gilbertus Porretanus*): Bishop of Poitiers; b. at Poitiers 1070; d. there Sept. 4, 1154. He studied in the episcopal school of Poitiers, then in Chartres under Bernard of Chartres, whose realistic Platonism he appropriated. In Paris he heard first William of Champeaux, then his pupil and opponent Abelard, in Laon the famous theologians Anselm and Radulf. In knowledge he stood far above the average of the scholarship of his time. From 1125 to 1136 he was chancellor and presiding officer in the cathedral school in Chartres; in 1137 he became teacher of dialectics and theology in Paris; in 1141 he removed to his native city as leader of the episcopal school, and in 1142 he became also bishop. Two zealous archdeacons of his church denounced him in Rome for heresies in regard to the Trinity, and Bernard of Clairvaux became one of his chief opponents. Pope Eugenius III. postponed the decision to a council to be held in Reims in 1148. Gilbert was asked to furnish an authentic copy of his commentary on the *De trinitate* of Boetius. There were extracted from it four assailable sentences for the council at Reims, according to which he taught (1) that the divine essence was not God; (2) that the attributes of the persons were not the persons themselves; (3) that the theological persons could not be predicated in any proposition (it would be wrong to say, for instance, that God is the Father); (4) that the divine nature was not incarnated. In knowledge of the Fathers and in dialectics Gilbert was far superior to his opponents, also to Bernard. The latter set up a confession of faith in opposition to Gilbert, but the cardinals were against him. Bernard had to humble himself, although the pope approved his confession in a general way. Gilbert agreed to purify his manuscripts from errors, and after reconciliation with his opponents returned to Poitiers where he administered his diocese until his end, much respected as a teacher; but he does not seem to have corrected his book. Gilbert's philosophy is a consistent realism, combined with the dialectic method of Aristotle. To the mystics he naturally appeared as the champion of a dangerous rationalism. Walter of St. Victor called him one of the "four labyrinths of France." But the earnest and solid character of the man, his devotion to the Church, and his personal piety are a guaranty that his doctrine and activity were not destructive although he asserted the right to liberty of scientific investigation. (R. SCHMIDT†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gilbert's Commentary on the writings of Boetius are in *MPL*, lxiv., his *Principia* and three letters are in *MPL*, clxxxviii. The writings of Gaufredus, secretary to Bernard of Clairvaux against Gilbert are in *MPL*, clxxxv. Consult: Otto of Freising, *Gestorum Friderici I. libri*, book i., chaps. 48, 50–61, in *MGH, Script.*, xx (1868), 338–491; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xii.; Berthaud, *Gilbert de la Porrée et sa philosophie*, Paris, 1892; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiv. 342 sqq., 1119–20, x. 654–666; *KL*, v. 599–601.

GILBERT, gil'bert **(GUILBERT), SAINT, OF SEMPRINGHAM:** Founder of the order of Gilbertines, or Sempringham Canons (*Ordo Gilbertinorum canonicorum, Ordo Sempringensis*); b. at Sempringham (20 m. s.s.e. of Lincoln), Lincolnshire, England, about 1083; d. there Feb. 4, 1189. He was educated at Paris, and after being ordained to the priesthood in 1123 became parish priest at Sempringham and Tyrington. In 1135 he founded a house for seven destitute girls, who lived in strict seclusion, and after several other houses of the same type had been established, he requested Pope Eugene VII. to unite his foundations with the Cistercian order. The pope declined, however, and Gilbert then built houses for canons near the nunneries, separating the two with the utmost strictness. The canons were placed under the rule of St. Augustine, and the nuns under that of St. Benedict, but while the control of the entire community was vested in the hands of the monks, the nuns were regarded as owning the property of the order. To all the houses, which soon contained 2,200 monks and several thousand nuns, were attached almshouses, hospitals, orphanages, and similar institutions. Gilbert reached the age of 106 years, and was canonized by Innocent III. in 1202. The order of Gilbertines was suppressed by Henry VIII., after it had come to number twenty-two double convents. It never spread outside of England. In its system of double convents the order offers a partial parallel to the order of Fontevraud (q.v.), while the employment of lay brothers to attend the monks and of lay sisters to attend the nuns recalls the *religio quadrata* of Cluny. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources: The authoritative life, by a member of his order, is in W. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, vol. vi., pp. i.–xcix. following p. 945 in the ed. of London, 1817; two shorter lives are in *ASB*, Feb., i. 567–573; Walter Mapes, *De nugis curialium distinctiones*, ed. T Wright for the Camden Society, London, 1850; Ralph de Diceto, *Opera historica*, ed. W Stubbs, no. 68 of Rolls Series, 1876; the works of St. Bernard of Clairvaux (q.v.). Consult: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, ii. 188 sqq.; A. Butler, *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs*, Feb. 4th; *DNB*, xxi.

325–317; Rose Graham, *St. Gilbert of Sempringham, and the Gilbertines*, London, 1901.

GIL'DAS, called the Wise: Author of the oldest historical work of Christian Britain, the *De excidio et conquestu Britanniæ ac flebili castigatione in reges, principes et sacerdotes*, quoting the title from one of the latest editors, Theodor Mommsen. It is sometimes called the "Querulous Book," and was divided by an early editor, Thomas Gale, without good reason, into two parts, a *Historia* and an *Epistula*. A tenth century chronicle puts the death of Gildas in 570. All other traditions about him, including his visits to Brittany and Ireland, are doubtful. He states himself, according to the most probable interpretation of a corrupt passage of his work (*MGH, Auct. ant.*, xiii. 3, chap. xxvi., *Chronica minora*, p. 40, ll. 16–20), that he was born in the year of the battle of Mount Badon [and that this occurred in the forty-fourth year before the time of writing. Hence it has been inferred that he was born in 493 and wrote c. 537], but the date of the battle of Mount Badon is uncertain. Less doubtful is the inference that the work was written before 547 (cf. chaps. xxxiii. sqq.). And beyond question the author was a well-informed, Romanized Briton, notwithstanding his clumsy Latin, who judged his countrymen with a monk's severity and criticized them with ruthless zeal [cf. W Bright, *Early English Church History*, Oxford, 1897, 24, 30–32]. Other writings are ascribed to Gildas, but without good authority. [He was a popular saint in Brittany and was the reputed founder of a monastery at Ruys, which became famous as the place of retirement of Abelard. His work has historical value chiefly from the absence of anything better.] (F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: The work of Gildas is in *MPL*, lxix. 327–392; with the exception of chaps. ii.–xxvi., it is in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 34–107. The best editions are by T. Mommsen in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, xiii. 3, *Chronica minora sæc. iv.–vii.*, part 3 (1898), 1–110; and by H. Williams, with transl., London, 1899. There is an Eng. transl. by Giles, London, 1841, reprinted in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library*, vol. iv. The life of Gildas by the monk of Ruys is in *ASM*, i. 138–139, less fully in *ASB*, Jan., iii. 573–574. Two lives are given by J. A. Giles, *Vita quorundam Anglo-Saxonum*, London, 1854. For criticism consult: T. Mommsen, ut sup., pp. 1–24, 91–110; C. G. Schöll, *De ecclesiasticæ Britorum Scotorumque historiæ fontibus*, Berlin, 1851; J. O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, i. 471–494, Duhlin, 1875; A. de la Borderie, *La Date de la naissance de Gildas*, in *Revue Celtique*, vi (1883–85), 1–13; A. Anscombe, *St. Gildas of Ruys and Irish Regal Chronology of the Sixth Century*, London, 1893; H. Zimmer, *Nennius vindicatus*, Berlin, 1893; J. Briel, *Saint Gildas, abbé de Rhuys*, Vannes, 1908; *DNB*, xxi. 344–346.

GILEAD. See Peræa.

GILES (GILLES), jîl [Fr.] *or* jailz [Eng.] (Lat. *Ægidius*), SAINT: A saint of great reputation from the ninth century onward. Apparently he spent some time in Provence as a hermit, and was then at the head of a monastery founded by him, in the vicinity of which a town named after him Saint-Gilles sprang up (11 m. e.s.e. of Nîmes). As the brief of Benedict II. in favor of his monastery dated Apr. 26, 685 (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 2127), is a forgery, there are no certain facts for his biography. His festival is Sept. 1. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: The subject is well discussed in *DCB*, i. 47–49. The early life with commentary is in *ASB*, Sept., i. 284–304; the *Miracula* are best given in *Analecta Bollandiana*, ix. 393–422, Paris, 1890; and the life by William of Berneville is published by G. Paris, and A. Bos, Paris, 1881. Consult: J. de Kerval, *Vie et culte de S. Gilles*, Le Mans, 1875; E. Remhry, *S. Gilles, sa vie, ses reliques, son culte*, 2 vols., Bruges, 1879–82.

GILFILLAN, GEORGE: Clergyman of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland; b. at Comrie (20 m. w. of Perth), Perthshire, Jan. 30, 1813; d. at Arnhalt, Brechin (8 m. w. of Montrose), Aug. 13, 1878. He studied at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and from 1836 till his death was pastor of the School-Wynd church at Dundee. He was a zealous worker for the cause of liberal and progressive thought, and was active in the promotion of mechanics' institutes, free libraries, and popular lectures. He brought to Dundee such lecturers as R. W Emerson, Samuel Brown, and John Nicol the astronomer, and himself delivered several courses of popular lectures. Gilfillan is best known as a man of letters. Altogether he published more than a hundred books and pamphlets, including various critical editions of the poets. His most important works are, *Hades, or the Unseen* (Dundee, 1842), a sermon that was attacked by John Eadie and Alexander Balfour; *A Gallery of Literary Portraits* (Edinburgh, 1845; 2d ser., 1850; 3d ser., 1854); *Bards and the Bible* (1851); *Christianity and Our Era* (1857); *Alpha and Omega* (2 vols., London, 1860); *Night: a Poem* (1867); *Modern Christian Heroes* (1869), and *Martyrs and Heroes of the Scottish Covenant* (7th ed., 1903).

Bibliography: *DNB*, xxi. 352–353.

GILGAMESH. See Babylonia, VII., 3, § 2.

GILL, JOHN: English Baptist, Biblical scholar; b. at Kettering (14 m. n.n.e. of Northampton), Northamptonshire, Nov. 23, 1697; d. at Camberwell (2 m. s. of St. Paul's, London) Oct. 14, 1771. He attended the Kettering grammar-school for a short time, became pastor at Higham Ferrers in 1718, and in 1719 entered upon a pastorate of fifty-two years at Horsleydown, Southwark. In 1748 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Aberdeen. He was a profound scholar and a voluminous author. His most important works are, *The Doctrine of the Trinity Stated and Vindicated* (London, 1731); *The Cause of God and Truth* (4 parts, 1735–38), an able answer to Whitby's *Five Points; An Exposition of the New Testament* (3 vols., 1746–48), which with his *Exposition of the Old Testament* (6 vols., 1748–63) forms his *magnum opus* (best ed., 9 vols., Philadelphia, 1811–19); also *A Dissertation on the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language* (1767); *A Body of Doctrinal Divinity* (1767); and *A Body of Practical Divinity* (1770).

Bibliography: J. Rippon, *Brief Memoir of the Life and Writings of John Gill*, London, 1838; *DNB*, xxi. 355.

GILLESPIE, GEORGE: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Kirkcaldy (11 m. n. of Edinburgh) Jan. 21, 1613; d. there Dec. 16, 1648. After his graduation from the University of St. Andrews he became chaplain to John Gordon, and in 1634 chaplain to John Kennedy. He became pastor of the parish of Wemyss in 1638, and of Greyfriars Church,

Edinburgh, in 1642. He preached before Charles I. at Holyrood Sept. 12, 1641, and received a pension from Charles Nov. 16. In 1643 he was chosen a member of the Westminster Assembly Though the youngest member of that body he proved to be one of its ablest debaters. He took his leave of the Assembly July 16, 1647. A few weeks later he presented the confession of faith to the General Assembly at Edinburgh and secured its ratification. In Sept., 1647, he was elected to the High Church of Edinburgh, and in 1648 he was moderator of the General Assembly. His writings, which are almost entirely controversial, include an anonymous *Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland* (n.p., 1637), of which the Scottish privy council ordered all copies to be collected and burned; *An Assertion of the Government of Scotland* (1641); and *Aaron's Rod Blossoming; or, the Divine Ordinance of Church-Government Vindicated* (London, 1646). His works were edited, with a memoir, by W M. Hetherington (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1843–46).

Bibliography: Sources are: R. Wodrow, *Hist. of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1829–1830; idem, *Analecta*, Glasgow, 1842; Hew Scot, *Fasti ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*, 5 parts, London, 1871. Consult: W M. Hetherington, *Hist. of Church of Scotland*, pp. 182–197, New York, 1881; *DNB*, xxi. 359–361 (where other literature is indicated).

GILLESPIE, GEORGE DE NORMANDIE: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Western Michigan; b. at Goshen, N. Y., June 14,1819; d. at Grand Rapids, Mich., Mar. 19, 1909. He was graduated at the General Theological Seminary in 1840, was ordered deacon, 1840, and ordained priest 1843. He was rector of St. Mark's, Leroy, N. Y. (1843–45), St. Paul's, Cincinnati, O. (1845–51), Zion, Palmyra, N. Y. (1851–61), and St. Andrew's, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1861–75). In 1875 he was consecrated bishop of the newly created diocese of Western Michigan. He wrote *The Season of Lent* (New York, 1877).

Bibliography: W S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, New York, 1895.

GILLESPIE, THOMAS: Founder of the Relief Church in Scotland; b. at Clearburn (2 m. e. of Edinburgh) 1708; d. at Dunfermline (16 m. n.w. of Edinburgh) Jan. 19, 1774. He studied at the University of Edinburgh, then attended Doddridge's academy at Northampton, where he was ordained Jan. 22, 1741. On Sept. 4 following he was admitted to the parish of Carnock, near Dunfermline. For refusing to take part in the settlement of a minister who was opposed by the people he was deposed by the General Assembly in May, 1752. After preaching to large open-air meetings during the summer he settled in Dunfermline the following winter and formed an independent congregation there. In 1761 he joined Thomas Boston (the younger), independent minister at Jedburgh, in ordaining a minister over the parish of Colinsburgh. On Oct. 22, 1761, the three congregations of Dunfermline, Jedburgh, and Colinsburgh formed themselves into a presbytery for the relief of Christians deprived of their church privileges. The Relief Church thus established united with the Secession Church in 1847, the two forming the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland (see Presbyterians). Gillespie's posthumous *Treatise on Temptation* was edited by J. Erskine (Edinburgh, 1774).

Bibliography: W Lindsay, *Life of T. Gillespie*, ed. J. Harper, Edinburgh, 1849; G. Struthers, *Hist. of the Rise . . of the Relief Church*, Glasgow, 1843; Hew Scott, *Fasti ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*, iv. 580, London, 1871; *DNB*, xxi. 365–366.

GILLETT, jil'let, CHARLES RIPLEY: Presbyterian; b. in New York City Nov. 29, 1855. He studied at New York University (B.A., 1874; A.M., 1876), Union Theological Seminary (1877–80), and the University of Berlin (1881–83). He was librarian of Union Theological Seminary, 1883–1908, as well as instructor in theological encyclopedia since 1893 and secretary of the faculty since 1898. He became registrar in 1908, and since 1900 has been temporary curator in the department of Oriental Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum, New York City. He was literary editor of the *Magazine of Christian Literature*, 1891–97, and besides compiling the general catalogue of Union Theological Seminary (New York, 1886, 1898) and catalogues of the Egyptian antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum and of the stone sculptures in the Cesnola collection of the same institution (1896), he wrote the third volume of the *Descriptive Atlas of the Cypriote Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York, 1903), and translated A. Harnack's *Das Mönchtum, seine Ideale und Geschichte* (New York, 1895) and G. E. Krüger's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (1897).

GILLETT, EZRA HALL: American Presbyterian; b. at Colchester, Conn., July 15, 1823; d. in New York City Sept. 2, 1875. He was graduated from Yale in 1841, and from the Union Theological Seminary in 1844. He was pastor of a Presbyterian church in Harlem (New York City) from 1844 to 1868, when he became professor of political economy, ethics, and history in New York University. Besides numerous articles in the *American Theological Review*, the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, the *Historical Magazine*, and other periodicals, his publications include, *The Life and Times of John Huss* (2 vols., Boston, 1861); *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1864); *God in Human Thought* (2 vols., New York, 1874); and *The Moral System* (1874).

GILLIN, JOHN LEWIS: Dunker; b. near Hudson, Ia., Oct. 12, 1871. He studied at Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Ia. (Lit.B., 1894), Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. (B.A., 1895), Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1904), and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1906). From 1895 to 1901 he was pastor of the Brethren church at Waterloo, Ia., and since 1905 has been connected with Ashland College, Ashland, O., first as professor of church history and social sciences (1905–06), later as president (since 1906). He was also moderator of the General Conference of his denomination in 1904–06. In theology he is, "in general terms, a modified Ritschlian," and has written *The Dunkers: A Sociological Interpretation* (New York, 1906).

GILMORE, gil'mōr, **GEORGE WILLIAM:** Congregationalist; b. in London May 12, 1857 He was educated at Princeton University (A.B., 1883) and Union Theological Seminary (1886), and in 1886 was appointed by the United States Commissioner of Education, at the request of the king of Korea, to found the Royal Korean College at Seoul, Korea. He remained in Korea with that institution until 1889, and after his return to the United States taught in the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute and in private schools till 1893. He was then successively instructor in English Bible (1893–95) and professor of Biblical history and lecturer on comparative religion (1895–99) in Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me., after which he was professor of Old Testament language and literature and the history of religion in Meadville Theological School from 1899 to 1906. Since 1905 he has been a member of the editorial staff of the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, to which he has contributed the main portion of its bibliography and numerous articles, especially on comparative religion. In addition to many studies in scientific and theological periodicals and book-reviews on Old Testament subjects and comparative religion, he has written *Korea from its Capital* (Philadelphia, 1892) and *The Johannean Problem* (1895), and has compiled *Literature of Theology* (under the editorship of Bishop J. F. Hurst; New York, 1896).

GILMOUR, JAMES: Scotch Congregationalist and missionary; b. at Cathkin (5 m. s. of Glasgow) June 12, 1843; d. in Tientsin (70 m. s.s.e. of Peking), China, May 21, 1891. After studying at the University of Glasgow (B.A., 1867; M.A., 1868) and at Cheshunt Congregational Theological College (14 m. n. of London; 1867–69), he was accepted by the London Missionary Society as missionary to reopen the long-suspended mission in Mongolia. Consequently he studied a year in the society's missionary seminary at Highgate (a London suburb 4½ m. n.n.w. of St. Paul's), and Chinese in the city. In 1870 he left for Peking, and after a few weeks there pressed forward into Mongolia. Until 1882 he spent his summers with the nomadic Mongols, acquired their language, adopted their dress, lived in their tents and upon their food, and as far as possible made himself one with them. He increased his hold upon them by practising medicine. In the winters he lived in Peking, ministering to such Mongols as he found in need of aid. In 1874 he married and his wife shared his experiences and dangers. In 1882 he made a visit home and was induced to write his well-known book, *Among the Mongols* (London and New York, 1883), which tells so much and so graphically about those nomads. In 1883 he returned to his exposed life. His wife could not stand the strain and died in 1885, leaving two boys. Solitary and sad, he took up work with the agricultural Mongols of Eastern Mongolia and carried it on till his own death, which was hastened by his trials and dangers. He was a missionary hero, lived for the strange people he loved so much, and will go down in the annals of missionary history as "Gilmour of Mongolia."

Bibliography: R. Lovett, *James Gilmour of Mongolia*, London and New York, 1892.

GILPIN, BERNARD: English clergyman, called "The Apostle of the North"; b. at Kentmere (17 m. s.w. of Keswick), Westmoreland, 1517; d. at Houghton-le-Spring (10 m. s.e. of Newcastle-upon-Tyne) Mar. 4, 1583. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford (B.A., 1540; M.A., 1542; B.D., 1549), where he was elected to a fellowship and admitted to holy orders in 1542. He was one of the first scholars elected to Christ Church, on the completion of Wolsey's foundation by Henry VIII. To clear up his theological doubts he went abroad in 1552 and lived for several years in Louvain and Paris. On his return to England in 1556 he was made rector of Easington and archdeacon of Durham, despite the fact that he had now adopted the theology of the Reformation. Soon afterward he became rector of Houghton-le-Spring. His life at Houghton is said to have been a ceaseless round of benevolent activity; and his extensive charities here and throughout the northern counties soon won for him wide popularity, which, coupled with his Protestant views and his fearless denunciation of clerical vices, naturally made him enemies among the clergy. He was accused before Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, and would have been tried for heresy, and probably beheaded, but for an accident. While on his way to London for trial he broke his leg; and before he was able to continue his journey Queen Mary died. In 1559 he declined the bishopric of Carlisle, and in 1560 the provostship of Queen's College, Oxford. His most important charity was the foundation of a large grammar-school at Houghton. A sermon preached by Gilpin before Edward VI. has been preserved (London, 1581; reprinted 1630).

Bibliography: G. Carleton wrote a life in Latin, London, 1628, Eng. transl., 1629. W. Gilpin, *Life of Bernard Gilpin*, London, 1752, reissued in *Lives of the Reformers*, vol. ii., 1809; A. à Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, i. 129, ib. 1820; *DNB*, xxi. 378–380.

GILSE, JAN VAN: Dutch theologian; b. Oct. 19, 1810; d. at Amsterdam May 24, 1859. At the age of eighteen he entered the Mennonite institute at Amsterdam, and after receiving his degree, eight years later, served as pastor at Koog and Zaandyk, and finally at Amsterdam. On the death of Koopman, Gilse was chosen his successor as professor of theology in Amsterdam representing the Mennonites, and held this position from Oct. 9, 1849, until he died. His collected essays and an anthology of his sermons were edited after his death, with a comprehensive biography, by P. J. Veth (*Verspreide en nagelaten schriften*, 5 parts, Amsterdam, 1860). Special mention may be made of his studies on the Muratorian Canon (q.v.), and on the meaning of the phrase "Catholic Epistles," which he believed to connote the epistles recognized by the Church Catholic and received as writings of importance among the books of the New Testament.

(C. Sepp†.)

GIRALD DE BARRI, called *Giraldus Cambrensis:* Welsh ecclesiastic; b. at Manorbier Castle (5 m. s.e. of Pembroke), Pembrokeshire, Wales, 1146 or 1147; d. after 1216. He was educated in Paris,

returning to Wales in 1172. His abilities and family connections with the Welsh and Irish nobility made him a fitting agent of the English crown in the effort to extend its power in Wales and to introduce the Roman hierarchy. The archbishop of Canterbury commissioned him to reform the diocese of St. Davids, particularly to introduce celibacy and to collect tithes. He carried the work through with a high hand and, as a reward for his success, was made archdeacon of Brecknock (1175). In 1176 the chapter of St. Davids chose him to succeed his uncle, David Fitzgerald, as bishop of that see, hoping that he might attain to metropolitan rank, independent of Canterbury. Owing to English opposition he retired and till 1180 lectured with much approval on canon law in Paris. He was commissary to the bishop of St. Davids, as royal chaplain attended Prince John in Ireland (1185–1186), and in 1188 accompanied Archbishop Baldwin through Wales, preaching the crusades. He did good service in keeping Wales peaceful and loyal after the death of Henry II (1189). In 1198, while he was living in retirement in Lincoln, the chapter of St. David again nominated him for bishop, but, as before, the archbishop of Canterbury would not have a Welshman. For four years Girald prosecuted a suit to obtain the see; he visited Rome three times, suffered many hardships and vicissitudes, but finally yielded, became reconciled with the king and archbishop, and spent the remainder of his life in retirement, devoted to literary work.

Girald wrote many works which are a strange mixture of truth and fiction, trivialities and important facts; his value as a historian is impaired by his vanity, partizanship, credulity, and use of legend and fable. Nevertheless he presents a picture of his time, and his information has importance in the absence of anything better. His descriptions of Ireland and Wales (*Topographia Hiberniæ, Itinerarium Cambriæ, Descriptio Cambriæ*) furnish about all that is known of land and people in his period. In his *Speculum ecclesiæ* and *Gemma ecclesiastica* he scourges the monastic life as he knew it. The *Expugnatio Hiberniæ* is the most important of his historical works. In *De jure et stato Menevensis ecclesiæ* he seeks to justify his claims to the bishopric. The *De rebus a se gestis, De invectionibus liber*, and *Speculum electorum* (letters, poems, addresses) are autobiographical and display his vanity and self-confidence. There is an excellent complete edition of his works, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. F. Dimock, and G. F. Warner (*Rolls Series*, no. 21, 8 vols., London, 1861–91). The *Itinerarium Cambriæ* has been published with translation and sketch of his life by Sir R. C. Hoare (2 vols., London, 1804–06; the transl. is also in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library*, xli.). (C. Schöll†.)

Bibliography: A valuable work is J. Lynch, *Cambrensis Eversus*, ed. M. Kelly, 3 vols., Dublin, 1848–52; also by the same editor, S. White, *Apologia pro Hibernia adversus Cambri Calumnias*, ib. 1849. Consult Brewer's preface to the ed. of the works mentioned in the text; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.*, cf. Index; *Gérold le Gallois*, in *Mémoires de l'académie des sciences de Caen*, 1887–88, pp. 117–180, 1889, pp. 3–73; H. Owen, *Gerald the Welshman*, London, 1889

GIRDLE. See Vestments and Insignia, Ecclesiastical.

GIRDLESTONE, ROBERT BAKER: Church of England; b. at Sedgley (13 m. n.w. of Birmingham), Staffordshire, Oct. 3, 1836. He studied at Charterhouse, London, and Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1859), and was head of the translation department of the British and Foreign Bible Society 1866–76, principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, 1877–89, and minister of St. John's, Downshire Hill, Hampstead, 1889–1901. He is an honorary canon of Christ Church. He has served on various committees and subcommittees connected with the Church Missionary Society, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Jews' Society, the National Protestant Church Union, and similar organizations. In theology he is a liberal Evangelical, but is conservative on Biblical questions. He has written *Anatomy of Scepticism* (London, 1863); *Dies Iræ* (1869); *Synonyms of the Old Testament* (1871); *How to Study the English Bible* (1887); *Foundations of the Bible* (1890); *Doctor Doctorum* (1892); *Deuterographs: Duplicate Passages in the Old Testament* (1894); *The Student's Deuteronomy* (1899); *Grammar of Prophecy* (1901); *Why do I believe in Jesus Christ* (1904); *The Churchman's Guide* (1905); and *Monotheism, Hebrew and Christian* (1907).

GLABRIO, glā-brî'ō, **MANIUS ACILIUS:** Roman consul in the year 91, afterward banished and put to death by Domitian 95 A.D. He belonged to a family distinguished in Roman history from 200 B.C. till the end of the empire, especially in the second century, and has interest for church history because of certain fragments of epitaphs discovered by De Rossi in 1888 in an aisle of the catacombs of St. Priscilla on the Via Salaria near Rome. Because of the honorary epithets employed, the epitaphs can hardly refer to freedmen of the gens Acilia, but must mark the resting-places of actual members of the family (cf. *Prosographia imperii Romani saeculorum I.–III.*, ed. E. Klebs, pp. 7–8, nos. 54–59, Berlin, 1897), who were evidently, from the wording of the inscriptions, Christians or at least friends of Christians. Evidence thus appears to be offered that even before the time of Commodus (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, v. 21) some of the prominent circles of the Roman nobility were favorably disposed toward Christianity, and perhaps actual conversions occurred. It is possible that Glabrio was put to death as a Christian (see Domitian).

(Edgar Henneke.)

Bibliography: G. de Rossi, in *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana*, pp. 15 sqq., 103 sqq., table v., 1888–89; W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii. 272, London, 1890 (gives early sources for a life).

GLADDEN, WASHINGTON: Congregationalist; b. at Pottsgrove, Pa., Feb. 11, 1836. He was graduated at Williams College in 1859, and held pastorates at Brooklyn, N. Y. (1860–61), Morrisania, N. Y. (1861–66), and North Adams, Mass. (1866–1871). He was then a member of the editorial staff of the New York *Independent* 1871–75 and pastor of the Congregational Church at Springfield, Mass., 1875–82, also editing the *Sunday Afternoon* (Spring-

field) 1878–80. Since 1882 he has been pastor of the First Congregational Church, Columbus, O. He has written *Plain Thoughts on the Art of Living* (Boston, 1868); *From the Hub to the Hudson* (1869); *Workingmen and their Employers* (1876); *Being a Christian* (1876); *The Christian Way* (New York, 1877); *The Lord's Prayer* (Boston, 1880); *The Christian League of Connecticut* (New York, 1883); *Things New and Old* (Columbus, O., 1884); *The Young Men and the Churches* (Boston, 1885); *Applied Christianity* (1887); *Parish Problems* (New York, 1888); *Burning Questions* (1889); *Santa Claus on a Lark* (1890); *Who Wrote the Bible?* (Boston, 1891); *Tools and the Man* (1893); *The Cosmopolis City Club* (New York, 1893); *The Church and the Kingdom* (Chicago, 1894); *Seven Puzzling Bible Books* (Boston, 1897); *Social Facts and Forces* (New York, 1897); *Art and Morality* (1897); *The Christian Pastor* (New York, 1898); *How Much is left of the old Doctrines?* (Boston, 1899); *Straight Shots at Young Men* (New York, 1900); *Social Salvation* (Boston, 1901); *The Practise of Immortality* (1901); *Where does the Sky begin?* (1904); *Christianity and Socialism* (New York, 1905); *New Idolatry and Other Discussions* (1905); and *The Church and Modern Life* (1908).

GLANVILL, JOSEPH: English clergyman, connected with the school known as the "Cambridge Platonists" (q.v.); b. at Plymouth 1636; d. at Bath Nov. 4, 1680. He was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, but had a close mental affinity with the Cambridge school, especially with More. He took orders, conformed at the Restoration, and held several church preferments, the last being the incumbency of the Abbey Church at Bath (1676) and a prebend at Worcester (1678). Among his numerous works, none equals for brilliancy his early essay on *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (London, 1661), from a passage in which Matthew Arnold received the suggestion for his famous poem "The Scholar Gipsy." *Lux Orientalis* (1662) is a reproduction and defense of More's doctrine of the preexistence of souls. The attempt to find an empirical basis for supernaturalism led Glanvill, like More, to combine a singular measure of credulity with his philosophy in the work which in its final form (1682) bears the title of *Sadducismus Triumphatus*. It is nothing but a collection of ghost-stories to support an ingenious argument on the possibility of spiritual existences under the form of witches and apparitions, with some chapters on the notion of spirit translated from More's *Manual of Metaphysics*. Besides the controversy to which this gave rise, Glanvill took a vigorous part in another on behalf of the new Royal Society and the right of free scientific inquiry. He comes into contact with the Cambridge School again in an essay on *Anti-Fanatical Religion and Free Philosophy* which appeared with several others in 1676. In its fictitious narrative, a sort of continuation of Bacon's *New Atlantis*, he describes a visit to the happy imaginary country of Bensalem, depicts the character and teaching of the Cambridge divines under a thin disguise, and offers what is really the most effective of the several contemporary vindications of the school.

Bibliography: Besides the literature under Cambridge Platonists, consult: The account of Glanvill's life and writings, by H. More, prefixed to *Sadducismus triumphatus*, London, 1726; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 1244, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; *DNB*, xxi. 408–409.

GLAS, JOHN: Scottish sectary, founder of the sect of Glassites or Sandemanians; b. at Auchtermuchty (17 m. w.s.w. of St. Andrews), Fifeshire, Sept. 21, 1695; d. at Perth Nov. 2, 1773. He was educated at St. Leonard's College, St. Andrews (M.A., 1713) and at the University of Edinburgh, and was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church at Tealing, Forfarshire, May 6, 1719. Here he became an independent in his views, and in *The Testimony of the King of Martyrs* (Edinburgh, 1727) he denied the right of the civil authorities to interfere in religious matters. For his publication he was suspended by the Synod of Angus and Mearns Apr. 18, 1728, and deposed from the ministry Oct. 13. Despite the intercession of influential friends the deposition was affirmed by the commission of the General Assembly Mar. 12, 1730. Glas then formed an independent church at Dundee. In 1733 he removed to Perth, where he built the first church of the new sect. Here he was joined by Robert Sandeman, who married his daughter and became the leader of the sect in England and America (see Sandemanians). The works of Glas, in four volumes, appeared at Edinburgh in 1761, and in a more complete edition in five volumes, Perth, 1782–83.

Bibliography: Walter Wilson, *Hist. and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches*, iii. 261–262, 4 vols., London, 1808–1814; William Anderson, *The Scottish Nation*, ii. 307, ib. 1870; E. Grub, *Eccl. Hist. of Scotland*, iv. 55, Edinburgh, 1861; Hew Scott, *Fasti ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*, 5 parts, London, 1871; *DNB*, xxi. 417–418.

GLASS (*Glassius*), **SALOMON:** Lutheran theologian; b. at Sondershausen (28 m. n.n.w. of Erfurt) May 20, 1593; d. at Gotha July 27, 1656. He occupies an honorable position among the strict orthodox who in the middle of the seventeenth century were preparing the way for a transition to Spener's attitude. From 1612 to 1615 he studied philosophy at Jena, and then went to Wittenberg for a year. His health obliged him to return to Jena, where Johann Gerhard had recently begun to lecture. A scholarship enabled him to enjoy for five years the lectures and daily intercourse of this "archtheologian and model dogmatician." Glass had already begun to make a special study of Hebrew with its cognates. In 1617 he was made master of philosophy, and in 1619 adjunct professor in the philosophical faculty. Owing to his timidity, and perhaps also to conscientious scruples, he long refused to appear in public disputations or in the pulpit; when the university offered him the degree of doctor of theology, he hesitated to accept it, even when commanded by his princely patrons. In 1621 he was appointed to the chair of Hebrew, which was usually considered a transition rom philosophy to theology. In 1625 he was called to Sondershausen as superintendent, and in the following year he accepted the doctor's degree from Jena. But a greater distinction awaited him. Gerhard, on his death-bed, had designated his beloved pupil as his successor, and after some discussion the request was complied with in 1638.

This position Glass occupied only two years. He was then summoned to Gotha by Duke Ernest I. as court preacher and general superintendent, and aided his sovereign in all his beneficial endeavors. Such a thorough Biblical theologian and a man of such practical piety could find no pleasure in the passionate scholastic disputes of those times, though he did enter the controversial field against the mystics who disparaged the authority of Scripture. To those who charged even such a man as Johann Arndt with heresy, he said: "He who loves not Arndt must be afflicted with the spiritual dyspepsia." In his estimation the spread of pure doctrine availed little where it was not united with the life. Faithfully adhering in his own belief to the statements of the symbolical books, he yet maintained a conciliatory attitude in the syncretistic controversies which raged for decades with such animosity. He seems to have had no intimate relations with Calixtus, though he had with some of his friends and admirers. The duke, anxious for harmony, had asked for an opinion for his own information. Glass replied with great moderation, avoiding everything which could hurt the orthodox, but doing justice to Calixtus. Even his friend, the fanatical Michael Walther, did not dare to reject this opinion, though he soon afterward opposed it in essential points. The strict orthodox, however, disliked it so much, that, as it was published only after the author's death and without his name, doubts were raised as to its genuineness.

Glass's greatest scientific work is his *Philologia sacra* (Jena, 1623–36), a kind of Biblical-philological encyclopedia, which was extravagantly praised by his contemporaries as a key to all Biblical difficulties. It shows, indeed, very great diligence and the necessity of following the general standards of higher instruction and scientific method. It rests on an extensive knowledge of Scripture and of Hebrew and rabbinical literature, and contains a valuable collection of illustrations and many acute linguistic observations. For the first time is found here an attempt at consistent study of the grammatical peculiarities of New Testament diction, the Hebrew coloring of which is shown. But its critical positions are taken from the narrow standpoint of the time, the grammar is not satisfactory, and its rhetoric and logic are antiquated. See EXEGESIS OR HERMENEUTICS, III., § 7

GEORG LOESCHE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A full list of Glass's works is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, vi. 671–672. Consult: the preface to Crenius' edition of the *Opuscula*, 1700; J. C. Zeumer, *Vitæ professorium Jenensium*, p. 141, Jena, 1711; *ADB*, ix. 218–219; *KL*, v. 612–613.

GLOAG, PATON JAMES: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Perth May 17, 1823; d. at Edinburgh Jan. 9, 1906. He studied at Edinburgh (1840–43) and St. Andrews (1843–44), and held pastorates at Dunning, Perthshire (1848–60), Blantyre, Lanarkshire (1860–1870), and Galashiels, Selkirkshire (1870–90). He was Baird lecturer in 1869 and moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1889, while after his retirement from the active ministry in 1890 he was temporary professor of Biblical criticism in the University of Aberdeen 1896–99. He wrote *The Assurance of Salvation* (Edinburgh, 1853); *Justification by Faith* (1856); *The Primeval World, or, the Relation of Geology to Revelation* (1859); *The Resurrection* (London, 1862); *Practical Christianity* (Glasgow, 1866); *Commentary on Acts* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1870); *Introduction to the Pauline Epistles* (1876); *The Messianic Prophecies* (Baird lectures for 1869; 1879); *Life of Paul* (1881); *Commentary on James* (1884); *Exegetical Studies* (1884); *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles* (1886); *Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians* (London, 1887); *Introduction to the Johannine Writings* (1891); *Subjects and Mode of Baptism* (Paisley, 1891); *The Life of St. John* (London, 1893); *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (Edinburgh, 1895); and *Evening Thoughts* (1900). He likewise translated a number of German commentaries on various books of the New Testament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. S. Gloag, *Paton J. Gloag. A Memoir*, Edinburgh, 1908.

GLOËL, JOHANNES: German exegete; b. at Cörbelitz (near Magdeburg) Apr. 22, 1857; d. at Erlangen June 16, 1891. He was educated at the gymnasium in Magdeburg, studied at Halle and Berlin, was for a time private tutor, then assistant preacher at the cathedral in Berlin. After acting for a short time as court preacher to the Prince of Reuss in Ernstbrunn he became inspector of the Silesian school of beneficiary students at Halle, and in 1884 undertook a journey to Holland for the purpose of study. Subsequently he became a teacher at the University of Halle and in 1888 professor at Erlangen where he taught three years. He was a man of wide education, thorough knowledge of his special branches, unwearied diligence and scientific courage. His early death hindered the full development of his scientific labors. He published *Hollands kirchliches Leben* (Wittenberg, 1885); *Der Heilige Geist in der Heilsverkündigung des Paulus* (Halle, 1888); and *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes auf ihre Berechtigung geprüft* (Leipsic, 1890).

W. CASPARI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The address of W. Caspari at the burial was published, Erlangen, 1891.

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS, GLORIA PATRI. See LITURGICS, III.

GLOSSES, BIBLICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL.

Origin and Development of the Terms (§ 1).
Glosses in the Greek World (§ 2).
Transference to the West (§ 3).
Influence on Encyclopedic Works (§ 4).
Modern Use in Biblical Criticism (§ 5).

A gloss is a marginal note employed for explanation or illustration. The term is derived from the Greek *glōssa*, "tongue, speech, dialect." The use of marginal notes can be traced to classical times when they were employed to explain for Greek students the meaning of obsolete, provincial or foreign words, especially such as occurred in the Homeric poems. Indexes of the glosses were made together with their equivalents in the common speech, and thus began the work of lexicography. (On the question whether the New Testament phrase *lalein glōssais*, etc., "to speak with tongues," has any connection

1. Origin and Development of the Terms.

with this usage cf. Bleek in *TSK*, ii. 1. 1829; see SPEAKING WITH TONGUES.) *Glossa* came to mean any word not in common use at any particular time or one used in a limited sense and so requiring elucidation. A synonym, *glossēma*, came into use later when, especially in Alexandrian times, annotation of manuscripts was required because of the spread of the Greek language. Naturally this annotation developed from mere explanation of words to discussion of grammatical forms and then of subject-matter. The use of glosses passed to the Romans, by whom the term *glossarium* was coined.

The ready-made term *glossa* was applied to the marginal notes found in the Biblical manuscripts, such as the *ḳere* of the Old Testament (see KERI AND KETHIBH) and the explanations of Hebrew terms used in the New Testament. The term *Glossæ sacræ* was used of the collections of difficult passages which occurred in the Bibles in various languages with the accompanying elucidations, and soon came to be applied to the explanations alone.

2. Glosses in the Greek World.

How the glosses multiplied is understood when it is remembered that the earliest Christian teaching and preaching consisted in large part of rendering the Bible into the tongues used by the hearers. Naturally the difficult passages were annotated on the margin. The scope of the annotations was gradually enlarged, and came to embody the substance of oral and then of written tradition concerning the matter treated, especially matters which concerned the rendering of Hebrew terms. Such discussion and elucidation was particularly needed in the Greek world in connection with the Septuagint, where unusual Greek constructions were employed in the attempt to reproduce the Hebrew original, and with the renderings of Symmachus and Aquila. In cases of differences of text the marginal notes came to embody the different readings or at any rate to indicate them. From such collections as these, concerned in great part with the explanation of individual words, containing mainly excerpts from the most popular commentaries, developed the so-called *Glossæ sacræ*, of which a good example is the lexicon of Hesychius, either in its original or developed form. Others of this kind are the *Lexeōn synagōgē* of Photius, the lexicon of Suidas, the so-called *Cyril-Glossarium*, the lexicon of Zonaras, the *Etymologicum magnum*, and the work of the sixteenth century compiled by the Benedictine Varinus Phavorinus (on these cf. J. C. G. Ernesti, *Glossæ sanctorum Hesychii, Suidæ et Phavorini*, Leipsic, 1785–86; F. G. Sturz, *Zonaræ glossæ*, ib. 1818).

An activity, the exact analogue of that just described as applied to the Greek Bible, was exerted in the West upon the Latin, in which the necessities were of the same character. But as the marginal notes consisted not only of explanations of individual words, but of longer remarks (cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinum*, chap. vi.), the term *glossa* came to mean the "assigned meaning of the passage," as for example in the *Etymologiæ* (i. 30) of Isidore of Seville and in a passage from Alcuin (*MPL*, ci. 858), though this did not exclude the older meaning of an elucidation of single words. But in the case of Latin equivalents used to explain words in the text, it often occurred that they were written between the lines. From this the custom developed to reserve the margin for the longer annotations which grew into connected comment, to which in particular the term *glossa* in the singular was applied. Thus the word came to be equivalent often to "commentary," though it could still be used in its original sense of "explanation of obscure words." In the Middle Ages the word received a double connotation: it meant either explanation of single words or comment upon an entire work, such as the Bible. Some authorities used the term to designate the *ḳere* of the Hebrew Bible, others included part at least of the Masoretic apparatus. Then it meant any collection of exegetical explanatory remarks, whether written between the lines or on the margin or interjected paragraphically into the text. As an example of the kind of work to which this name was applied the work of Walafrid Strabo may be mentioned, a compilation from the writings of Alcuin, Ambrose, Augustine, Bede, Cassiodorus, Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, Haimo, Hesychius, Jerome, Isidore of Seville, Origen, Rabanus, and others, which for six centuries was the *vade-mecum* of exegesis (see CATENÆ, § 8). The character of this work was, however, rather theological than philological. Mention should also be made in this place of the "Interlinear Gloss" of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117). From the fourteenth century on, many manuscripts of the Vulgate were enriched by the addition of these two works or of parts of them, together with the *Postillæ* of Nicholas of Lyra and the *Additiones* of Paul of Burgos, written at the bottom and even so printed. But with these there were also interlinear glosses which dealt with matters philological, some of which originated in the schools of the monasteries. Of course this same kind of work was done on other books, like the writings of Homer, patristic works, canons, hymns, legends, monastic rules, and the like. And these interlinear glosses naturally developed into interlinear versions in the various tongues of the peoples to whom Christianity was conveyed.

3. Transference to the West.

In another direction these glosses developed into a kind of literature which anticipated the work of encyclopedia (see ENCYCLOPEDIA, THEOLOGICAL), of which Isidore's *Etymologiarum libri viginti* is a specimen (on this literature cf. S. Berger, *De glossariis et compendiis exegeticis*, Paris, 1879, pp. 7 sqq.) and represents a large class of works. Other works of this character are the *Glossæ* of Solomon III., bishop of Constance (d. 919), printed 1483; the *Papiæ elementarium doctrinæ erudimentum*, compiled c. 1050 and often reprinted since the fifteenth century; the *Panormia* of Osbern of Gloucester (c. 1150, in Mai, *Classicorum auctorum tomi*, Rome, 1836); the *Dictionarius sive de dictionibus obscuris* of John of Garlandia, often printed; the *Repertorium vocabulorum* and *vocabularium biblicum* of Alexander Neckam (d. 1215); and the *Breviloquus vocabularius*, recast and edited by Reuchlin. That bilingual glossaries should develop is a matter of course.

4. Influence on Encyclopedic Works.

The latest use of the word applies to those insertions which, in the course of the transmission of the text, have crept into the body of a work. They arise from the inclusion by a copyist of material which he found written between the lines or on the margin. This often occurs with set design though without evil purpose on the part of the copyist and also through his mistake. The result, however, often is that it is impossible to discover whether a corruption of the text occurs through an intended improvement or through importation of a marginal note. Corrections of this sort are found in the text of the original languages of the Bible, since the more a book is used and copied, the more likely are such corrections. This is the case with the Hebrew text. A means of detection is often the comparison of two or more translations (cf. Wellhausen's edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Berlin, 1893, § 269; F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*, Leipsic, 1891, p. 257, Eng. transl., London, 1892; and for the New Testament cf. E. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Brunswick, 1874, § 359, Eng. transl., 2 vols., Boston, 1874). In similar fashion the old versions were corrupted by the incorporation of glosses. This is the case with the manuscript of the Septuagint in spite of the criticism of such men as Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius, and of the Vulgate (cf. Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, Leipsic, 1841, §§ 11 sqq.; F. Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, Mainz, 1868, pp. 212 sqq., 266). For the marginal notes and references of English Bibles, which are of the nature of glosses, see BIBLES, ANNOTATED, AND BIBLE SUMMARIES, II.

5. Modern Use in Biblical Criticism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. vi. passim, Hamburg, 1798; J. G. Rosenmüller, *Historia interpretationis sacrorum librorum*, iv. 356 sqq., Leipsic, 1795; C. G. Wilke, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, ii. 192 sqq., Leipsic, 1844; K. Gödeke, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, i., § 13, Dresden, 1862; J. A. U. Scheler, *Lexicographie latine*, Leipsic, 1867; E. Steinmeyer and E. Sievers, *Althochdeutsche Glossen*, i.–iv., Berlin, 1879–98; P. Piper, *Literaturgeschichte und Grammatik der Althochdeutschen*, pp. 35 sqq., Paderborn, 1880; T. Birt, *Antike Buchwesen*, Berlin, 1882; H. P. Junker, *Grundriss der französischen Litteratur*, pp. 15 sqq., Münster, 1889; F. Blass, *Hermeneutik und Kritik*, Munich, 1892; U. Wattenbach, *Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, Leipsic, 1896; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, §§ 154, 216, 232 sqq.; *KL*, v. 708–716; and the works on introduction to the Old and the New Testament.

GLOSSES AND GLOSSATORS OF CANON LAW: Terms applied to the commentaries and commentators upon canon law. The pattern for a treatment of canon law and of the collections which contain it was given about the beginning of the twelfth century in the Bologna school of Roman law among the so-called "Legists," where in the second half of that century lectures were delivered on the work of Gratian, author of the first part of the *Corpus juris canonici*, the *Decretum* (see CANON LAW, II., § 7). Alongside the Legists thus arose schools of Canonists, Decretists, and Decretalists. The resulting literary activity busied itself in glosses or short explanations first of words and phrases, later of the subject-matter of the sources of canon law, which glosses were either interlinear or marginal. The books of law were supplied with abstracts (*summæ*), illustrations (*casus*) and rules (*notabilia, brocarda*). The usefulness of these earlier glosses and their continuous employment tended to produce still others until at length a comprehensive and rich body of comment developed which became digested into the *Apparatus, lecturæ, commentarii* of the period subsequent to 1400. Among the glossators on the work of Gratian were his pupil Paucapalea, Rolandus Bandinelli (afterward Pope Alexander III., 1159–81), Rufinus, Stephen of Tournay (d. 1203), Johannes Faventinus, bishop of Faenza (1160–90), Sicard, bishop of Cremona (1185–1215), and Johannes Teutonicus (d. 1245 or 1246). The work of the last-named, which depends upon the labors of his predecessors, is the *Glossa ordinaria* (c. 1215) to the *Decreta*. The *glossa ordinaria* of the collection of decretals of Gregory IX. originated with Bernard of Botone, professor and chancellor of Bologna, who used the labors of Vincent of Spain (c. 1240), Gottfried of Trani (d. 1245), and Sinibaldus Friscus, later Pope Innocent IV. Among the glossators of the *Liber sextus* was Johann Andreä, whose work is the *glossa ordinaria* upon the *Liber sextus*; he also made the *glossa ordinaria* to the *Clementina*. Inasmuch as the work of these men brought about reciprocal activity between the Church and the school, their results have not merely a literary interest, but a practical one, and they are of importance for the history of canon law.

(P. HINSCHIUS†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: M. Sarti and M. Fattorini, *De claris archigymnasii Bononiensis professoribus*, ed. C. Albicinius and C. Malagola, Bonona, 1888–96; F. C. von Savigny, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, vols. iii.–vii., Heidelberg, 1843–51; J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, vols. i.–ii., Stuttgart, 1875–77; R. Ritter von Scherer, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts*, i. 254, Graz, 1886; *KL*, v. 716–717.

GLYN, EDWARD CARR: Church of England, bishop of Peterborough; b. at London Nov. 21, 1843. He was edueated at Harrow School and University College, Oxford (B.A., 1867), and was ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of Doncaster under C. J. Vaughan in 1868–1871, vicar of St. Mary's, Beverley, in 1872–75, vicar of Doncaster in 1875–78, and vicar of Kensington in 1878–97, as well as rural dean in 1881–97. In the latter year he was consecrated bishop of Peterborough. He was also chaplain to the archbishop of York in 1877–93, honorary chaplain to Queen Victoria in 1881–84, and chaplain in ordinary 1884–97 His literary activity has been restricted to individual sermons and pamphlets.

GNAPHEUS, GULIELMUS. See FULLONIUS, GULIELMUS.

GNOSTICISM.

Gnosis and Gnosticism (§ 1).
Origin and Meaning (§ 2).
Sources (§ 3).
A Religion, not a Philosophy (§ 4).
Reliance upon Authority (§ 5).
Its Dualism (§ 6).
The Church and Gnosticism (§ 7).

Gnosticism (derived from Gk. *gnosis*, "knowledge") is a degenerate form of true *gnosis*, the true meaning of which as regards Christianity is gained from the New Testament, and is the knowledge

and recognition of the divine plan of salvation by means of a God-given insight. According to the oldest tradition, the Lord said to his disciples (Matt. xiii. 11): "it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." To the Apostle Paul, gnosis was a function of the spiritual man (I Cor. ii. 11 sqq.), which every Christian possessed in its essentials. But as "there are [illegible] ties of gifts, but the same Spirit" the gift of gnosis, as well, could be given to some one in special measure (I Cor. xii. 4 sqq.). In a narrower sense, the apostle regarded gnosis as the discerning of the way in which the divine purpose of salvation had led man, in particular the people of the Covenant, in the course of history, and which, therefore, could be gained only from Scripture. Paul was aware of the moral dangers of such a gnosis; he knew that the possessor of it might imagine himself to be somewhat better than other men; nor was gnosis one of the three things that abide (I Cor. xiii. 13). It is a theological, more properly a theosophical, function; and for that very reason must be subordinated to faith, the specifically religious function. This conception is the one that has always been upheld by the Church. Even where it might seem as though the possessor of gnosis occupied a higher place than the poor in spirit, yet the point is emphasized again and again, that the possession of gnosis as such does not carry with it the assurance of redemption; and Clement of Alexandria, the ecclesiastical Gnostic, writes: "There are not, then, in the same Word some 'illuminated (Gnostics) and some animal (or natural) men'; but all who have abandoned the desires of the flesh are equal and spiritual before the Lord" (*ANF*, ii. 217).

Gnosis and Gnosticism.

But not all were of this opinion. At quite an early period in Christendom the contrary view sprang up, which in the First Epistle to Timothy (vi. 20, R.V.) is aptly designated as "the knowledge which is falsely so called." Not individuals alone, but whole groups of such men, professing to be Christians, called themselves Gnostics (Carpocratians: Irenæus, *ANF*, i. 350–351; cf. Epiphanius, *MPG*, xli. 373; Naasseni, in Hippolytus, *ANF*, v. 47; [illegible] in Origen, a loosely defined sect, *ANF*, iv. 57[illegible]; cf. again, Epiphanius, *MPG*, xli. 321, 364, 641, and other passages). They boasted, moreover, "that they alone have sounded the depths of knowledge" (Hippolytus, *ANF*, v. 47; cf. I Cor. ii. 10), and these "deep things" they pretended to have "[illegible]ed" through a speculative process not [illegible] upon Scripture. Irenæus, who opposes [illegible] sed the term Gnostics in this latter signification, and since that time it has come to be the current designation for them. But this, at best, is only a formal qualification, the concrete analysis of which is difficult in proportion to the diversity of the phenomena to be comprehended under one general head.

Gnosticism was not a specifically Christian phenomenon but belonged to religious history in general. It happened quite often that Gnostic sects professed to be Christian when in reality they had nothing in common with Christianity; so that Origen justly said (*ANF*, iv. 585): "nor would Celsus, in his treatise against the Christians, have introduced among the charges directed against them statements which they never uttered."

2. Origin and Meaning.

On the other hand, many a religious sect seemed to be independent which really was only a variety of Gnosticism: e.g., the Mandæans and the Manicheans (qq.v.). At any rate the view that Gnosticism is only a partial phenomenon of Christian metaphysics, and only to that extent important, is too narrow; for, in order to understand Gnosticism completely, it should not be looked upon with the eye of the ecclesiastical historian and dogmatist, for whom those forms of Gnosticism are alone of interest which have acquired special significance in relation to the progress of Christianity, for the investigation of Gnosticism in religious history is yet in its rudiments, and has not hitherto produced convincing results. On the one hand, Gnosticism is apt to be closely associated with Hellenism, and is thought to be explained by reference to Greek philosophy (Joel), or, at any rate, in connection with the Greek mysteries (Weingarten and others), a theory culminating in Harnack's famous epigram, "the Gnostic systems represent the acute secularizing or Hellenizing of Christianity" (*Dogma*, i. 226). It is but an application of the same idea, to designate Gnosticism as Christian Orphism (Wobbermin), and by way of proof adduce the peculiar combination of theogonic and cosmogonic elements with the religious interest in expiation, consecration, deliverance. Others refer to the religious and magic sides of the Babylonian worship (Kessler: "the old Babylonian"; Anz: "the late Babylonian"), as though here was the native soil of Gnosticism, and mention also the influences of Zoroastrianism, and assume that the movement, as it spread over Christian Greek territory, lost its original character. However, no less expert an investigator than Jean Réville, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, xxxviii., 1898, 220–224), opposed this reference of Gnosticism to Chaldaic and Persian sources with the remark that an Egyptologist might advocate, with equal propriety, the derivation of Gnostic ideas from Egyptian speculative schools; and indeed Reitzenstein did derive a fair portion of Gnostic views from Egyptian syncretism. And yet those investigators might prove to be in the right who refer the origin of Gnosticism to the speculations of Babylonian or Zoroastrian priests. Bousset, taking for his guide some data supplied by Anz, has lately shown that the chief Gnostic problems are best explained by those Oriental conceptions (the seven and the *mētēr*; the mother and the unknown father; dualism; the first man; elements and substance; form of the redeemer; mysteries). In all the Gnostic systems he saw branches of a common tree whose roots deeply penetrated the syncretistic soil of the dying antique religion. And however it might be in particular instances, in general he judged correctly when he said; "Gnosis is not a phenomenon that presses forward; it is rather backward and stationary, a reaction of antique syncretism against the rising universal religion of Christianity" (W Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, p. 7, Göttingen, 1907). The doctors of the Church were right

in resisting with all their might these tendencies among their congregations, even if they did not always use the right remedies.

[The Gnostics may be divided into: the Judaizing Gnostics; the Anti-Judaistic Gnostics; the Gnosticizing pagans; the Ophites; and later the Manicheans and New Manicheans. The chief among the Judaizers were the followers of Basilides (q.v.), of Valentinus (q.v.), of Cerinthus (q.v.), and of Bardesanes (q.v.). The greatest leaders of the Anti-Judaizers were Saturninus (q.v.), Cerdo (q.v.), and Marcion (q.v.). One curious sect of them were the Archontici described by Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xl.). Their founder was a hermit of Palestine, named Peter, but their principal seat was in Armenia. According to their sacred books there were seven heavens each with an *archon* or ruler, whence came their name; there was also an eighth heaven where dwelt the "mother of light." The ruler of the seventh heaven was the God of the Jews, and the Devil was his son. They rejected baptism but anointed the dying with oil and water to protect them from the archons of the lower heavens. See also DOCETISM. Among the Gnosticizing pagans were the Borborites or Borborians (dirt-eaters, from Gk. *borboros*, mud). See also the articles on CARPOCRATES AND THE CARPOCRATIANS, SIMON MAGUS, ANTITACTÆ, PRODICIANS, NICOLAITANS, OPHITES, and CAINITES. For an account of the later developments of Gnosticism see ENCRATITES, MANDÆANS, MANICHEANS and NEW MANICHEANS.]

3. Sources.

The Gnostic writings were of all kinds: Gospels (of Eve, Mary, Jude, Thomas, Philip, etc.); Apocalypses (of Adam, Abraham, Nicotheus, Zoroaster, etc.); Acts (of Peter, John, Thomas, Andrew, and Matthew); hymns (Naasseni, Bardesanes, "Books of Jeû"); odes (Basilides); psalms (Valentinus, Bardesanes, Marcionites); and homilies (Valentinus). Then, too, the Gnostics had their theological literature; dogmatic and philosophic treatises (Isidore, Valentinus, Theodotus, Bardesanes, Marcion); critical investigations (Ptolemæus, Apelles); commentaries on sacred writings and prophetic revelations (Basilides, Heracleon, Isidore); mystery books (*Pistis-Sophia*, "Books of Jeû," etc.). Of all these books, only a few have been preserved; but enough to apply a check to the heresy refutations (see below), and to give an insight into the Gnostic beliefs and ideas. Preserved intact are: (1) The letter of the Valentinian Ptolemæus (see VALENTINUS) to Flora (Greek text edited by A. Harnack in H. Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*, No. 9, Bonn, 1904); (2) *Pistis-Sophia*, the two "Books of Jeû," and a Gnostic work of unknown origin, in Coptic (ed. C. Schmidt, Leipsic, 1905; see OPHITES); there is an Eng. transl., *Pistis Sophia. A Gnostic Gospel (with Extracts from the Books of the Saviour appended). Originally translated from Greek into Coptic and now for the first time Englished from Schwartze's Latin Version of the only known Coptic MS. and checked by Amélineau's French Version, with an Introduction* by G. R. S. Mead (London, 1896); (3) three Gnostic writings of the second century: "Gospel according to Mary," "Wisdom of Jesus Christ," "Acts of Peter," in Coptic (not yet published. The "Gospel of Mary" is the source which Irenæus used for his account of the Barbelo-Gnostics: cf. C. Schmidt, in *Philotesia für Kleinert*, Berlin, 1907). There are also preserved many fragments, especially in Clement and Origen, which afford much information about Basilides and Isidore, Valentinus and Heracleon, as also about the Valentinians of the Oriental school (the so-called *Excerpta Theodoti*). Bardesanes has quite a different aspect when he is seen not only by the light of the polemics of Ephraim, but also by that of his own ideas, as shown by one of his pupils, in the "Book of the Laws of the Lands" (*Spicilegium Syriacum*, Syriac, Greek, and English, ed. Cureton, London, 1855). Again enough is known of Marcion and Apelles for a clear conception of their work.

4. A Religion, not a Philosophy.

The polemics of the ecclesiastical writers against heretics are, at best, but a secondary source, and that strongly colored by both defective knowledge and personal ill-will; although still a valuable source of our acquaintance with Gnosticism. Unfortunately the earliest writings of this kind (by Agrippa, Castor, Justin, Rhodon, Philip of Gortyna, Modestus, Hegesippus; see the separate articles) have been lost. In all probability, however, their substance was incorporated into extant writings on heresies by Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, into the so-called "Catalogues of Heretics" of the pseudo-Tertullian and are treated in the works of Philastrius, Augustine, Prædestinatus, etc. There is also a pagan tract on the subject: the discourse of Plotinus, *Adv. gnosticos* (*Ennead*, ii. 9).

The chief defect in all these expositions and refutations is the impossibility of adapting oneself to the opponent's platform; the eagerness to impute to him motives and intentions such as he either has not at all, or at least does not hold and pursue in the manner charged against him. The combaters of the heretics seem to maintain again and again that the speculative utterances of the Gnostics are merely philosophical, not religious; merely cosmological, not soteriological. This view is false. In the sense of the Gnostics, gnosis is religion; knowledge is redemption: to know, that is to be redeemed, is possible only for the spiritual man who has come from heaven and is prepared for eternity. Hence Gnostics and spiritual men become synonymous terms, and gnosis is the gift of grace which is imparted to the spiritual man in his very cradle and develops with his growth, resolving the riddles that surround him. "We are freed by the knowledge of these things: who we were, what we have become; where we were, and whither we were brought; whither we hasten and whence we were delivered; what birth is, and what regeneration" (*MPG*, ix. 696). The means of solving these questions varied, in each case, according to the spiritual elevation of the questioner: dualistic and pantheistic, mythological and pagan, Oriental and Hellenistic, mystical and profoundly thoughtful, speculations contributed their several strands to the composite fabric. Yet even in so abstruse a product as the philosophy of the Books of Jeû, redemption is still brought back to the dis-

revelation as manifested in Christ. Now the surest sign that this gnosis was a matter of religion and not of philosophy was the fact that its advocates made efforts to form associations; although it was not always clear where the school stopped and the church began, nor were Gnostics like Valentinus to be classed with the Oriental sectaries included under the designation of Ophites (q.v.), with whom organization on a mystic basis can be shown most distinctly. Still, not among these alone, but rather almost everywhere in Gnostic communities, mystic consecrations and symbolic rites of the utmost variety were customary alike at the beginning and end of religious services: such as induction into the bridal chamber, branding the right ear, baptism with water, fire, and spirit, anointing, celebration of communion, unction of the dying, and so on. Nor is it to be overlooked, that the religious way to salvation is also accompanied by the moral way. The spiritual man either strives to suppress and annihilate that which still fetters him to the material, by weakening and mortifying his body; or, thanks to his exalted state of mind in the possession of salvation, he believes himself exempt from accountability in respect to the deeds of his body, thus giving free course to the sensual desires, since they can not stain the spirit. In short, both asceticism and libertinism were prevalent among Gnostic sects.

5. Reliance upon Authority.

It is, finally, of particular significance that the heretical gnosis too was founded upon revelation authorities, and so emulated orthodox Christendom. The founders of sects and the foremost oracles of the Spirit drew power and instruction from direct converse with deity; prophecy stood in high esteem; great value was laid on tradition: whereby, just as the Church did, they contrived to link themselves to primitive Christianity. Basilides named Glaukias, supposedly an interpreter of Peter, as his teacher; Valentinus professed to have heard Theodas, a disciple of Paul; the Naasseni referred to James, brother of the Lord, and in like manner they esteemed Scripture tradition highly, although most of the Christian Gnostics saw the enemy of their gnosis in the God of the Jews, and consequently rejected his book, the Old Testament. Nevertheless the documents of primitive Christianity, in so far as they could trace them back to the Apostles, ranked with them as Holy Scripture; even though they tried first to render them orally acceptable by means of dogmatic interpretation. Above all, however, they enriched sacred literature with their own productions (cf. 3, above).

6. Its Dualism.

Then the radical Gnostic tendency that gave special offense to the orthodox mode of thinking was its dualism which was strongly opposed to orthodox Christianity, based on monism. This dualism was plain in every way, and may be treated under the following heads: (1) Dualism in theology and cosmology: for the Gnostics separated the supreme God and the creator of the world. So, too, in the elaborated forms of gnosis, the supreme God was considered as the God of the new covenant, the creator of the world as the God of the old covenant; but in seeking to show the highest honor to Christianity by separating its God from the God of Judaism, they thereby uprooted Christianity from the very soil in which it had been planted as a historic religion. (2) Dualism in Christology: the divine eon, sent from on high to redeem the spiritual that is in the material, was Christ, but a sharp distinction was drawn between this supermundane Christ and the historical Jesus. With the latter the eon either merely contracted a temporary union (joined him in baptism, but forsook him before death); or the Jewish Jesus was only the manifestation of the heavenly redeemer, who was obliged to assume a body in order to become visible; or, lastly, the entire visible apparition of the redeemer, his birth, life, and death, was in semblance only. (3) Dualism in anthropology: men were distinguished as spiritual men, in whom the divine portion to be redeemed lived bound to the material portion; and as material men, who, having deteriorated into matter, were not an object of redemption. There were besides, in certain cases, the men " of soul," who were destined to a certain degree of blessedness, and for whose understanding the verities of salvation had to be clothed in their historic dress. (4) Dualism in soteriology: redemption was separation of spirit from matter: *a.* beginning even at present; hence there was either mortification and contempt of the material, by way of asceticism, or else libertinism. *b.* The process became complete in the future: hence there was rejection of the primitive Christian hopes as to a future life: especially the belief in the resurrection of the body.

7. The Church and Gnosticism.

The Church did right in opposing this dualism with all possible vigor. The crisis evoked by the assaults of Gnosticism was the greatest and most momentous in its consequences of all the convulsions to which Christianity was exposed in the course of its growth in the soil of antique civilization. Had Gnosticism not been overcome, then Christianity had forfeited its peculiar genius; torn loose from its historic foundation, it would have been drawn into the general vortex, thus perishing like the religions of collapsing paganism. The danger was especially serious in so far as the still immature organization of the congregations, only partly formed and insecurely established as they were then, was easily accessible to perversions, and offered the enemy various points for attack. Men of might then strove to strengthen this organization, by creating the standards the acknowledgment of which was absolutely required of every one who would be a Christian; such as the Apostles' Creed, the collection of Apostolic writings, the Apostolic office. Like shrewd physicians, too, they did not scruple to inject into the sick body some of the poison that threatened to destroy its life, and in fact, both in faith and in manners and customs, the ancient catholic Church distinctly showed the influence exerted by the vanquished syncretism on its successful conqueror.

Gnosticism was indeed the bastard offspring of genuine, real gnosis; yet injustice would be done if it were forgotten that amid the well-nigh inex-

tricable tangle of the most heterogeneous tendencies and strivings, there lurked many a sublime invention. The reader of the Books of Jeû, to be sure, is not prepared by their introductory strain of beautiful praise for the living Jesus to be plunged afterward into that ocean of barren formulas in magic, the bulk of their contents. On the other hand, the reader who lays aside the Naassenian Hymn without feeling its inward hold on him, may well begin to ask himself, does he know what religion is? Athwart the transparent envelop of Valentine's wonderful cosmic poem may be caught gleams of the loftiest and profoundest ideas in a very noble setting. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the extant literature of the Gnostics consult: the edition of Irenæus by A. Stieren, i. 901–971, Leipsic, 1853; the *Pistis Sophia*, ed. M. G. Schwartze and J. H. Petermann, Gotha, 1851–53 (Coptic and Latin), cf. the Fr. transl. by E. Amélineau, Paris, 1895, Eng. transl., mentioned above in § 3; *Codex Brucianus*, ed. C. Schmidt in *TU*, vii. 1–2 (1892); idem, in *SBA*, 1896, pp. 839–847; Harnack, *Geschichte*, i. 143–201; idem, *Zur Quellenkritik des Gnosticismus*, Leipsic, 1873, and cf.: G. Volkmar, *Die Quellen der Ketzergeschichte bis zum Nicänum*, Leipsic, 1855; R. A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*, Vienna, 1865; H. Stähelin, *Die gnostischen Quellen Hippolyts*, in *TU*, vi. 3 (1891); J. Kunze, *De historiæ gnosticismi fontibus*, Leipsic, 1894.

On the system in general the fullest discussion is still J. Matter, *Hist. critique du gnosticisme*, 3 vols., Paris, 1843–44. Consult further: A. Neander, *Genetische Entwickelung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme*, Berlin, 1818; idem, *Christian Church*, consult Index; E. Burton, *Heresies of the Apostolic Age*, Oxford, 1829; J. A. Möhler, *Der Ursprung des Gnosticismus*, Tübingen, 1831; F. C. Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis oder die christliche Religionsphilosophie*, ib. 1835; R. Massuet, in Stieren's *Irenæus*, ut sup., ii. 54 sqq.; R. A. Lipsius, *Der Gnosticismus*, Leipsic, 1860; W. Möhler, *Geschichte der Kosmologie in der griechischen Kirche*, Halle, 1860; E. Amélineau, *Essai sur le gnosticisme égyptien*, Paris, 1866; T. Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*, London, 1875; J. B. Lightfoot, in his Commentary on Colossians, ib. 1879; M. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, i. 114–170, Breslau, 1880; G. Koffmane, *Die Gnosis nach ihrer Tendenz und Organisation*, ib. 1881; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipsic, 1884; C. W. King, *The Gnostics and their Remains*, London, 1887; A. Dieterich, *Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des späteren Altertums*, Leipsic, 1891; G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, Göttingen, 1894; A. Harnack, *Untersuchungen über das gnostische Buch Pistis-Sophia*, in *TU*, vii. 2 (1891); idem, *Dogma*, passim, consult Index; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, Göttingen, 1895; G. Wobbermin, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Urchristentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen*, Berlin, 1896; W. Anz, in *TU*, xv. 4 (1897); M. Friedländer, *Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus*, Göttingen, 1898; G. R. S. Mead, *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten; Sketches among the Gnostics of the first two Centuries*, London, 1900; E. H. Schmitt, *Die Gnosis. Grundlagen der Weltanschauung einer edleren Kultur*, Leipsic, 1903; E. Preuschen, *Zwei gnostische Hymnen*, Giessen, 1904; R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipsic, 1904; E. Bischoff, *Im Reiche der Gnosis; die mystischen Lehren des jüdischen und christlichen Gnosticismus, Mandäismus und Manichäismus und ihr babylonisch-astraler Ursprung*, ib. 1906; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907; E. Buonaiuti, *Lo Gnosticismo*, Rome, 1907; *DCB*, ii. 678–687; *KL*, v. 765–775; the literature under the articles named in the first paragraph of this article, the text-books and treatises on the church history of the period, and the works on the history of dogma.

GOA, ARCHBISHOPRIC OF: A metropolitan see in Portuguese India, founded in 1534 by Paul III. The first bishop was the Franciscan João Albuquerque, consecrated in 1537. After the extension of Christianity by the labors of St. Francis Xavier (q.v.), who landed at Goa in 1542, Paul III. raised the see to metropolitan rank in 1557, assigning to it as suffragan bishoprics Cochin, Malacca, and Macao, the last-named including the oversight of the Chinese and, from 1576, the Japanese missions. About 1570, three-fourths of the 200,000 inhabitants of the city were Christians. The increasing conquests of the Dutch diminished the importance of the city, and in 1753, in consequence of a plague, the residence of the Portuguese viceroy was removed to New Goa or Panjim (5 m. to the westward), which became the seat of government in 1845. The ancient city is now little but ruins, with few inhabitants; its most remarkable remaining monuments are the churches, of which that containing the body of St. Francis Xavier is a place of pilgrimage for the Roman Catholics of all India. The later history of the mission which was once so flourishing is an unhappy one. In the seventeenth century the Portuguese government, relying on the right of patronage originally conceded by the pope, made claims which could not be admitted, and on their rejection deliberately organized a schism which maintained its existence for over two hundred years, the consequences of which are not yet effaced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. A. E. de Silva, *Catholic Church in India*, Bombay, 1885; C. Dellon, *Hist. of the Inquisition at Goa*, London, 1748; *Life of Bishop Hartmann*, Calcutta, 1868; J. P. Kirsch and V. Luksch, *Illustrierte Geschichte der katholischen Kirche*, pp. 493, 547, 577, 601, Munich, 1905; *KL*, v. 775–780.